1: Niederle--5 E-5 1911 IX Slavic Peoples E/C
Bulgaria EE1
Serbs EF6

B. S. S.P. 101 time to determine the facts and here are the terms in which Mr. Florinskii worded his decision in 1908:

B. S. S.P. 197 101 "It seems to me," he said,[1-A] "that there is no valid reason at all for making the Macedonians a special ethnographic group. The principal criterion is deciding upon the division of this group between the Bulgarian and Serbian nationalities is established by the linguistic data. According to these, insofar as they are known at present--it has been determined that the majority of the Macedonian dialects have the fundamental characteristics of the Bulgarian language. It is only in northern Macedonia, in the districts of Skoplje, Tetovo, and Kratovo that the peculiarities of the Serbian language appear clearly in the Slavic idioms, through they are with certain peculiarities of the Balkan tongue."

Mr. Florinskii concludes by awarding the north /ix/ of Macedonia to the Serbs, and the remainder to the Bulgars.

000 "I do not know," I wrote in 1908, in connection with the publication of Mr. Florinskii's book (1), "if this judgment of Solomon

1. In l'Energie francaise, issue of 29 February.

will satisfy the two parties. In any case one may be certain that the Greeks will make fierce outcry. Be that as it may, I cannot urge the Serbs and the Bulgars too strongly to find a definitive modus vivendi. The Slavs could not possibly make too many concessions in order to unite themselves against the eternal enemies of their race: the Germans, the Magyars, the Greeks, the Turks."

In those matters which relate to the Slavs of Macedonia, Mr. Niederle has arrived at almost the same conclusions as Mr. Florinskii; but he has supported them by other arguments.

III.

S.P. 114 In writing the article "Slavs" for the Czech Encyclopedia, Mr. Niederle found it necessary to study certain problems of demography and anthropology. At that precise moment the Academy of Sciences of Saint Petersburg proposed the publication of an Encyclopedia of Slavic Philology under the direction of Mr. V. Jagic (1), the eminent /x/

1. See my article about Monsieur Jagic in the Journal des Savants, (Year 1908).

professor at the University of Vienna. Probably at the instigation of this distinguished scholar, they requested Mr. Niederle to write for this collection a volume upon the Slavic race. This volume written

1-A [Mr. Florinskii, professor in the University of Kiyev, 1908--Bagbist]

1: Niederle--15 E-5 1911 E16 Slavic Peoples E16
Historical Russia RA2

H.R. 101 S.P. 175

But alongside these external modifications, great changes were taking place in the internal life of the Russian people; tribal life was being replaced by provincial life. The ancient tribal units were being dislocated and were disappearing little by little into the new provincial organizations which formed themselves around the princes, and little by little a new division of the Russian people could be seen establishing itself, whereby the old tribal units were replaced by three large groups, differing with respect to language, internal organization and, in certain ways, to political life. Mr. Shakhmatov, in a remarkable essay published in 1899 by the Russian Review of Public Education, has not yet spoken science's final word. We must restrict ourselves to this simple statement. Already at the time of the Tatar domination, the old tribal units had grouped themselves, either as a result of their internal development, or as a result of external causes, into three groups:

In the south (between the San, the Pripet, and the Dnepr) the Ukrainian group which obviously was made up of the former Poliani, Drevliani, Volhynians, Dudlebi, Tiversti, Ulichi, a portion of the Severiani, and the remains of the Croats and the Serbs from the Carpathians;

In the north the Great Russians, made up principally of the Slavs from Novgorod, the Viatichi, the Krivichi, and a portion of the Severiani;

/16/ In the west the Belorussians or White Russians (including principally the former Dregovichi, the Radimichi, a portion of the Drevliani and Krivichi, and the remains of the Lithuanians).

At this period appeared the expressions Great Russia, Little Russia (Ukrainia) and White Russia (it is not known what this last epithet signifies).

S.P. H.R. [197]

The Little Russian (Ukrainian) group is the one which has remained the purest from the language viewpoint; the White Russian group is less pure, as it has been affected by the political union with Lithuania from the end of the thirteenth century and, later on, from the sixteenth century, by a strong Polish influence. The basic elements of the Great Russian group were extremely varied; but the one which was most influential of all was the city which was to become the center of the Russian world, namely Moscow.

Despite this division, the three groups remained three branches of the same nation. The languages were closely related; close ties bound them together from a political viewpoint (at the beginning the common struggle against the Tatars, later the union under the Muscovite

4 [Migrations and colonizations: cf. cat. 116, pp. 11-14--analyst]

S.P. T.R. 101 62

section of the guberniya. Estimates are not in agreement. Chubinskii in 1872 figured that in all of Bessarabia there were 100,000 Ukrainians. Nestorovskii in 1905 guessed at 250,000. The latest statistics have figured that the Russians comprised 27.8 % of the total population, or 540,000 (of whom 380,000 were Ukrainians).

Beyond the Dnestr, to the east, it is not easy to trace the boundary exactly. Retailed maps are lacking. The ethnographical maps which I have used extend the Russian domain as far as the Black Sea. But to the south of the line of Yampol, Balta, Olviopol (now Pervomaisk), Elizavetgrad (now Kirovograd), Slavyanoserbsk, and Novocherkassk, this domain is pervaded by so many islands of foreigners (Germans, Bulgars, Rumanians, Tatars, Greeks, Jews, Armenians) that the Russians in the south cannot be considered as forming a compact population. It would be impossible to delimit their territory exactly until after the most minute ethnographic examination. To date we do not have a sufficiently detailed study. According to /24/ Derzhavin the latest statistics have enumerated in the guberniya of Kherson 57 linguistic groups, in Bessarabia, 41, and in the guberniya of Tavrida, 39. The dominant element, nevertheless, is Ukrainian.

S.P. T.R. [197]

We reach the same conclusions for the provinces beyond the Dnepr, the Don, and the Volga. There are also many non-Russian elements and exact data and good ethnographic maps are lacking. On Russian maps--which are usually on a small scale--the Russian domain comprises the area between the Dnepr and the Don and stops at the Kuban (the Crimea being Tatar). In general the border begins on the shores of the Black Sea, at the town of Gagri below the Caucasus, crosses the mountains, curves around Pyatigorsk and Stavropol, draws near the left bank of the Don (there are 33.7 % Russians in the province of Terek), then skirts the Steppes of the Kirghiz and of the Kalmyk, and comes to the lower Volga, to the shores of the Caspian Sea and of the Terek. All along the Volga, from its mouth upwards, are situated numerous Russian towns and villages, cut off from each other by German, Finnish, and Tatar areas.

The Russian domain of the Volga cannot be delimited by a line; it is full of islands of allogenes which often interect one another These allogenic groups occupy a territory which extends approximately from the spot where the Volga bends towards the south from Saratov through Serdobsk, Morshansk and Murom to Nizhnii Novgorod (now Gor'kiy). To the north of the Volga the Russian population is compact;

S.P. T.R. 212 If one eliminates from the population the children below the age of nine, the number of literates rises to 41% for Poland and 30% for Russia. In 1897, in the area where Russian is spoken, 29.6% literate men and 9.34% women were estimated, which gives an average of 19.78%. In Austria, the Russians are also very poorly educated. The Austrian statistics of six years ago figured that there were only 21.8% literate persons among the Russians and Ruthenians. They, therefore, occupy the lowest rank among the Austrian Slavs, just as the Russians do among the civilized peoples of their Empire.

S.P. T.R. 619 S. 6. Differentiaton Within the Nation.--

The Russians, like the other great nations, have never formed a completely homogeneous people. From the first centuries of their history, a series of distinct and more or less divergent units appear, and, even after their grouping into a single political nation under the name of Russia, the former shadings of difference did not disappear. In part they cancelled each other out, they assumed new forms, a new development, /39/ and in some instances they became even more pronounced. This sharpening of differences became so pronounced during the last century that many people were unwilling to recognize a single Russian nation, but insisted that there were two nations: the Great Russians and the Ukrainians, and alongside them, a third national unit, less distinct it is true and less developed, the Belorussians.

000 I have explained above (S. 3)[1] how this tri-partition of the Russian realm took place. Putting aside for the moment the question of linguistics, I shall content myself with pointing out only what are today the internal and external affinities of these groups, wherein today lie the tendencies which, for political or scientific reasons, claim to make of them, instead of a single Russian nation, two peoples, the Great Russian and the Little Russian, otherwise called Ukrainian.

S.P. T.R. 197 The relationships of the three Russian groups have been studied particularly from a linguistic viewpoint. But it would be an error to believe that it is only a question of shades of dialect. There are verified differences in the domestic life of the people, in character and physical appearance, in historic traditions. However, language affords us with the element most susceptible of analysis, and it is from a linguistic point of view that the three groups may thus be distinguished:

1 According to Sobolevskii and Karskii, the territory of Great

1 [Cf. Cat. 116, pp. 11-17 -- Analyst]

S.P. T.R. 197

Russia is separated from the Byelorussian area by a belt of intermediate dialects which /40/ runs across Opotchka and Velikye Luki in the gubernıya of Pskov, passes through the gubernıyas of Tver, Smolensk, and Chernigov; the southern portion of the gubernıya of Tver, practically all of the gubernıya of Smolensk, and the northern portion of the gubernıya of Chernigov, bounded by the line of Rzhev, Briansk, Novgorod Seversk, and Chernigov, are purely or primarily Belorussian.

At Novgorod Seversk is located the junction, the point of contact where the Great Russian and Belorussian dialects meet the Ukrainian.

The Ukrainians and the Belorussians are separated by a line which runs from the Narev through Proujany, Luninets, to the Pripet River, and then follows this stream, except in the Mozyr area inhabited by the Belorussians, to the junction point which we just mentioned.

It is rather difficult to determine with precision the boundary between the Ukraine and Great Russia. It runs, roughly speaking, from Krolovets, crossing the southwestern portions of the gubernıyas of Chernigov and Kursk in the direction of the city of Soudja; passing through Oboian and Stary-Oskol, it goes towards Korotoyak on the Don, runs along the Don, and then turns towards the Donets. The northern portion of the territory of the Don is inhabited by Great Russians, the southern portion is mixed. In the eastern part of the gubernıya of Khar'kov there is a Great Russian island.

The Caucasus region is extremely variegated; the /41/ Great Russians occupy the territory of the Cossacks of the Terek and the basin of the Volga; they also colonized the greater part of Siberia where other nationalities may also be found. Besides, Great Russian colonies are scattered throughout the Ukraine; in turn, colonies of Ukrainians are to be found in the gubernıyas of Saratov, Samara, Astrakhan, Vologda and beyond the Ural.

The Great Russians are advancing particularly in the direction of Khar'kov. This city belonged to the Ukrainians at the beginning of the nineteenth century; today it numbers 58% Great Russians and 25% Ukrainians.

S.P. T.R. 161 197

S 7.--It is extremely difficult to estimate the strength of the three groups, considering the manner in which the censuses have previously been made in the Russian Empire. According to the census of 1897, 55,667,469 inhabitants stated that they spoke Great Russian (but in what geographic areas?), 5,885,547 Belorussian, and 22,380,551

S.P. T.S. 161 197

Ukrainian. If we take into account the annual increase of 1.5% during the four following years, we will then obtain the following figures for the close of the year 1900:

Great Russians	(approx.)	59,000,000
Belorussians	(approx.)	6,200,000
Ukrainians	(approx.)	23,700,000

To the latter, one must add almost all the Russians /42/ of Austria-Hungary, that is 3,805,023 (leaving out the 40,000 Jews who state that they are Ukrainians), and 500,000 who live in foreign countries. We will then have for the close of the year 1900 a total of 28 million. But the Ukrainian statisticians declare that this figure is too low and estimate that it should be much larger. Thus, very recently, for the year 1905, Mr. Nechuj-Levitskyj figures--for the entire world--37,206,000 Ukrainians, 31,174,000 of whom are in European Russia. We cannot accept these figures, but will admit of a total of 30 million.

Gnatiuk, at the end of the last century, estimated 30 million; Hrushevskyj, in 1906, 34 million; Karsky, for 1903, conceded about 8 and a half million Belorussians.

S 8.--The dialectal and ethnographic differentiation is not confined to these three principal groups. Within each of them there are to be found smaller groups which bear historic names or popular nicknames.

S.P. T.R. 101 197

These differences appear especially among the Ukrainians, where not only do the philologists find new dialects, but where history and the people themselves mark out a whole series of names, where certain peoples (as for example the Gorals of the Carpathians) have so unusual a physiognomy that one asks oneself if they do not have a peculiar origin, perhaps non-Slavic.

Chubinskii, in his extremely valuable collection /43/ of ethnography, recognizes three types among the Ukrainians of southern Russia: the Polesian, the Ukrainian, the Podolo-Galician.

The first, that of the Poliechouks (Polexiani of the ancient chronicles), inhabitants of the Polesie (1), in the southern portion of the

1. Polesie, the region which skirts the forest. Tr: districts of Kiyev, of Radomysl, in the Volhynia from the northeast to the river Goryn', in a portion of the gubemiyas of Siedlec and of Grodno which make up the Podlasie.

1: Niederle--32 E-5 1911 E/C Slavic Peoples E/C
Tsarist Russia R2
Cossacks RD2

S.P. T.R. 101 197

The inhabitants of the district of Pinsk call themselves the Pintchouks. They live to the north of the Goryn' River, on both banks of the Styr', beyond the Turya and the Pripet, and to the north of the Pina connect up with the Podliachiens of the gubemiya of Grodno.

S.P. T.R. C. 101

We find another Ukrainian type west of the Dnepr, in the guberniya of Kiyev, the central region of the Volhynia and the south-west of the Podolia. It is that of the Cossacks or Zaporozhians.

S P T R 197

They have presented and still present today an ethnographic oddity. There has been much discussion as to the origin of those fighting and trading associations which in the constant warfare against the Tatars and the Turks developed an ethnic individuality, especially from the point of view of their domestic life and social organization.

/44/ The ancient theories which represent them as being of foreign origin are certainly incorrect; it is certain that the Cossacks are of Russian origin. In accordance with the region in which their associations were founded and set up, they are distinguished today as Cossacks of the Kuban, of the Don, of the Terek, of the Ural, etc. Their types are different. Thus the Cossacks of the upper Don who speak Great Russian are blond, the Cossacks of the lower Don who speak Ukrainian [[61]] are, in great majority, very dark. The census of 1905 reported, for European and Asiatic Russia, 3,700,000 Cossacks who live in the Cossack provinces of the Don, of Orenburg (Chkalov), of the Kuban, of the Terek, of Astrakhan, of the Amur, of Transbaikalia, of the Seacoast, of Akmolinsk, of Semipalatinsk, of the Ural. Aside from the Russian Cossacks, there are also allogenic Cossacks, for example the Buriat Cossacks of Transbaikalia, the Kalmuk Cossacks of the Don, the Turkish Cossacks of the territories of Orenburg (Chkalov and of the Ural, the Mordvinian Cossacks of the territories of Akmolinsk and of Orenburg (Chkalov).

S.P. T.R. 101 197

In addition to the names of Cossacks and of Zaporozhians, one could come across not so long age the names of Stepoviks for the inhabitants of the southern steppes, of Poberezhtsi (river-dwellers) for the inhabitants of the southern part of the present Podolia, and of Volyntsi for those of the western portion of the district of Berdichev (guberniya of Kiyev) and of certain sections of Podolia.

/45/ To a third type belong the inhabitants of western Volhynia and of Galicia: on the frontiers of Galicia and of Poland they are called Rusini or Rusniaks. In the region of the Carpathians they also have a multitude of local names: Bukovinians, Krainians, Hrivniaks, Opolanes,

S.P. T.R. 101 197

Galicians, L'vovians and others, derived from the names of the locality which they inhabit. The principal element are the Gorals (mountaineers, from the word gora, mountain) of the Carpathians, who are also called Verkhovintsi (from verkh, summit). Four principal tribes are distinguished among these Russians: in the west, the Lemki, on the two slopes of the Beskid mountains, especially in the districts of Sandets, Jaslo Jaslo and Sanok; the Boiki, neighbors of the former, to the west of the San; the Tukholtsi, farther to the south, from the district of Sambor to the district of Stanislavov; and still further in the mountains, in the district of Kolomyja, of Stanislavov, in Bukovina, and in the Hungarian county of Marmaros, the Hutsuli (Huculi) are met with, who call themselves Christians, Rusniaks, or Russian people.

S.P. T.R. 101 197

Among the Russian population of the Bukovina, three types may be distinguished: the Podolians or Polianes, the Hutsuli and the Lipovani. The latter are religious heretics who left Russia in the eighteenth century.

S.P. T.R. [144]

The Hutsuli are a very peculiar and interesting tribe, an enigma of Slavic ethnology. /46/ They have given rise to all sorts of hypotheses. Ivan Vagilevitch links them with the Turkish Ouzes, Koshkov to the Thracians or to the Scythians; more recently Volkov looked for their origins in the Caucasus. Some accept a strong intrusion of foreign elements into the primitive Slavic element, while others consider them to be Slavs of pure blood. They are remarkable for their fine stature, for the antiquity and the richness of their customs, for their artistic sense, for their picturesque costume, but also for their lack of intellectual culture which places them in the lowest rank among the Slavs. It is estimated that 93% of them are still illiterate. The name Hutsuli is probably of Rumanian origin (goc, plus the Rumanian article ul). The names Boiki and Lemki are surnames given by their neighbors because of their use of the words lem and boi. Vagilevitch has seen in the Lemki--without good reason, however,--the remains of vanished Celts. In 1890 Shukhevych estimated their number at 60,000. (1)

S.P. T.R. [212]

S.P. T.R. [161]

1. A. Sobolevsky found the names Hutsuli and Boiki again in the Gulatsi and the Butsi of the guberniya of Kiyev (district of Tcherkassk). And he used this connection to support his theory on the arrival of Carpathian Russians at Kiyev after the Tatar invasion.

1: Niederle--34 E-5 1911 E16Slavic Peoples E16
Tsarist Russia R2

S.P. T.R. 101 197 Among the Belorussians dialectical shadings and local names of tribes can also be found; for example, the Polianes in the district of Slonim, the Siekals or Sakals in that of /47/ Wolkowysk. Among the Great Russians, despite the immense size of the space occupied by them, intercourse has always remained easy because of the evenness of the ground; no considerable differences in speech nor types, as pronounced as among the Ukrainians, have established themselves. However, there are to be found among them also local names due most frequently to differences in dialect. Thus, in the guberniya of Voronezh one finds the Iaguny, the Kaguny*, the Tsukany*, the Shchekuni*, the Talagai*; in the government of Kursk, the Saiany. In the government of Kaluga, the inhabitants of the western section of the district of Mosal'sk and of the districts of Bryansk and of Trubchevsk (guberniya of Orel) call themselves Polieshi*, and the inhabitants of the eastern section of the district of Mosal'sk, the Polianes. The inhabitants of the north bank of the Desna are called the Zadesentsy (Transdesniens) by the Ukrainians. Likewise, many names are used which are derived from those of cities, Muscovites, Novgorodians, etc.).

S.P. T.R. 141 S 9.--This differentiation of types is partly confirmed by the anthropological method. The Ukrainians of the south, indeed, set themselves off from the Belorussians and the Great Russians, not only by their manner of wearing their hair and their beard, but even by their bodily structure. Thus, we find in the south more brachycephalics, with darker coloring and taller stature than among /48/ the Great Russians and the Belorussians. But, on the other hand, these groups themselves are of far from perfect uniformity. Quite the contrary. What is known up to the present in the matter of the physical study of the Russian types shows rather outstanding variations among local groups, variations which are greater than, for example, the average difference between the Great Russian, the Ukrainian, and the Belorussian groups.

In general, if we refer to the anthropological signs gathered by A. Ivanovsky, here is what we can ascertain:

Among the Russians, the average height is about 1.65 meters. Among the Great Russians, 51% are found to be shorter, and 49% taller than this; among the Belorussians, 36% shorter, 64% taller; among the Ukrainians, 47% shorter, 53% taller.

S.P. T.R. 142 In the matter of the color of the eyes and the hair, the Slavs of Russia belong for the most part to a mixed type. It is only among the Belorussians that the pure blond type dominates (48%, against 31%

S.P. T.R. 577 186 centuries. However, formerly the conflict between the Great Russians and the Ukrainians, did not exist in its present day sense. On the contrary, the two parts had a sense of kinship, or even of unity, as may be seen in an examination of the motives for which Bohdan Khmelnitskyj gave himself to Moscow and to Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich (in 1653), after detaching the Ukraine from Poland.

S.P. T.R. 578 668 The conflict[1] between the two Russian nations did not in fact break out until the Nineteenth Century.

Its basic causes were:

1. The efforts of the Ukrainians to create or to revive a language and a literature of their own.

2. A whole series of scientific discussions upon the question as to what were the connections between the Great Russians and the Ukrainians, especially from a linguistic and an anthropological viewpoint.

Finally and above all:

3. The actual political and social status of the Ukrainians in the Empire and the general development in these latter years of social and democratic ideas.

/53/ Thus today the conflict is moving more and more from the literary and scientific field into the political field.

S.P. T.R. 578 668 538 The conflict began in 1798, when J.P. Kotljarevs'kji published in Ukrainian his Aeneid. From that date on there has been a great effort to create an indigenous literature. But these tendencies were quickly opposed by the government, which feared that this literary separatism might be prejudicial to national unity. And upon various occasions, especially in 1847, 1863, and 1876, it was forbidden to print or publish, save for a few rare exceptions, books in Ukrainian. But the result of these prohibitions was completely opposite from that which was intended. The tendencies toward literary emancipation asserted themselves so much the more strongly as they were more rigorously suppressed, and they found favorable soil in eastern Galicia, which belongs, as we know, to Austria.

S.P. T.R. 197 814 829 On the other hand, the conflict,[1] strengthened by the scientific discussions concerning the ties between the two nations, became aggravated. There were arguments about the antiquity of the Ukrainian idiom, especially in the Kiyev region, about the question of

1 [Between Great Russians and Ukrainians, cf. ch. 11, pp. 35-37. Ed.]

1: Niederle--38 E-5 1911 E16 Slavic Peoples E 16
Tsarist Russia R2

S.P.
T.R.
197
814
829

determining who had produced the earliest Russian annals and the first Russian literature in the State of Kiyev. These polemics took place especially between 1850 and 1860; they were marked by the works of Sreznevskii, of Lavrovskii, and particularly of Pogodin, who pretended to demonstrate that up to the fourteenth century /54/ Kiyev had been occupied by the Great Russians, the initiators of the history and the literature of the region, and that the Ukrainians had not come from the Carpathians until after the Tatar conquest. This theory found opponents among the historians of the Ukraine; it was revived later with much greater energy (in 1883) from a linguistic point of view by Sobolevskii, and refuted with no less vigor by the historians Dashkevich, Antonovitch, Grouchevsky, A. Iablononskii, and the philologists V. Jagić, A. Shakhmatov, A. Krymskyj, A. Kolessa, A. Loboda, etc.

Naturally, no one limited himself to the question of discovering when the Ukrainians first settled in Kiyev. They also studied the degrees of kinship of the two idioms. Was there only a single Russian language with two dialects, or must two different languages be recognized? These debates, in which the principal Russian and Slavic philologists participated, oddly favored the theory which tended to separate the two groups and to widen the chasm which was being dug between them.

T.R.
S.P.
814
829

But these theoretical polemics were not confined to the linguistics with which they dealt more and more frequently, and with a constant recourse to scholarly apparatus. Maksimovich had already declared that not only two languages, but two national types must be recognized in Russia; but he did not clearly formulate his doctrine. It was Kostomarov who ventured to do this and /55/ who produced a veritable revolution. He was followed by an entire series of anthropologists.

Maksimovich had not succeeded in formulating a precise distinction: Kostomarov succeeded in this in the article entitled: "The two Russian nationalities" published by the review Osnova (the Basis) in 1861. In this he pointed out the differences of history, of language, of customs, of character, of physical appearance, and he laid down this theory: that there are not only two Russian languages, but also two nationalities which differ completely the one from the other, and which history alone has united into a single unit.

This theory of Kostomarov had great success; it was developed

1: Niederle--41 E-5 1911 C/C Slavic Peoples F/C
Poland EA1

000 Of course this unity must be the product of reciprocal agreement, of a mutual understanding, and not of constraint or of force. The form of this agreement will be discovered by the leaders of the two parties when the memory of oppressions and persecutions is erased. And then,--as we like to hope--a ground for agreement will be found for a union both internal and /59/ towards the foreigner, while the two individualities will be preserved, as Kostomarov already hoped for. Then perhaps the apt words of Gogol will be realized. He wrote in 1844 to Mrs. Smirnov: "May the different strengths of the two races develop in such a manner that, when unified, they may produce something exquisite for humanity.".

• • • •

/61/

II

THE POLES

S.P. P. 101 § 11. Historical Introduction--The Poles constitute today the most important portion of the western group. They are the only people of whom it may be said that they have been established from time immemorial in the same region (between the Oder, the Carpathians, and the sea) and that they are the least remote from their cradle. They S.P. have always occupied a central position from a geographic point of [197] view, among the other Slav peoples, and the philologists assert that their language holds an analogous place among the Slavic idioms.

We know hardly anything about the ethnography of present-day Poland in antiquity. Even Ptolemy scarcely sheds any light upon the Poles. Many people would like to see the Poles in his Boulanes (Boulanes, but the preferable reading is Poulanes). Beginning with the ninth century of the Christian era, we have a little more light; but for want of documents we are unable to determine the boundaries of the Polish domain; on the other hand, we are not sufficiently informed /62/ of the character of certain tribes living upon the shores of the Baltic or to the southwest. At this period the Polish nation was probably not united; but it already stood out from the other Slavs and was designated by the name of Liakhs (or Lekhs). This is the name which they bear in the Kiyev Chronicle (1). Today,--if we lay aside the literary use of the word Lekh,--it is used in practice only for the people who are settled in the plain of western Galicia, between the Biala, Vistula, and San

1. See my Chronique de Nestor, p. 328. Translator.

S.P. P. 175 648

that up to the present all of these efforts have failed. At least, the results obtained are not in any manner in proportion to the pecuniary sacrifices. The law of expropriation voted in 1908 succeeded no better, and there is room to believe that all the efforts of the German "hakatists" (1) will break against the energetic resistance of the Polish people.

1. This name of Hakatists is given to a Prussian association founded in 1891 to colonize the routes to the east. This association was founded by Hansemann, Kennemann, and Tiedeman. It is from the initials of these three persons, H, K, T, that the word "hakatists" has been formed. (Translator).

Nevertheless, the situation of the Poles of Poznan and of Silesia remains a difficult one and there is no reason to hope that it will improve. The Prussian minister Von Arnim clearly stated in 1907 that they cannot be Germanized and that this is not being thought of. However, it is the goal towards which Prussia is steadily striving. And naturally the struggle /70/ of three and a half million souls against sixty million Germans can only be looked upon with anxiety.

And in fact Germanization is making serious progress among the Mazuri, in Silesia and Poznan, even though in certain places the Poles succeed in gaining the upper hand.

It is in Austria that the condition of the Poles is the most bearable. For the past forty years the former system of Germanization has been abandoned and the Polish nationality has developed in complete liberty; it even exercises a certain influence upon the destinies of the Empire and of the other nationalities.

000

S 12. The Domain of the Polish National Group.

We do not encounter as many difficulties in outlining this domain as we did in the case of the Russian domain. However, we do run into certain difficulties.

S.P. P. 197

Here again our principal criterion is the language.[1] It is upon the basis of the language that certain ethnographic maps have been drawn up in Prussia and in Austria. But the work has not always been done correctly. The latest census carried out in Prussia, has been based upon the mother tongue; but it is known that a great number of persons on the side of both the Poles and Germans have declared that they spoke

[1] [i.e. to determine the domain of the Polish national group.. Analyst]

S.P. P. 197 the two languages. In such a case how can the majority be determined? And how can the nationality be determined in /71/ the localities in which these belinguals must decide which group is in the majority? In Austria, in place of the mother-tongue, the habitual language (Umgangsprache) has been taken as the criterion. I do not believe, however, that this process has caused any serious injustice to the Poles.

In Russia the results of the linguistic census have not been used to draw up the ethnographic map, and we are reduced to individual guesses. The first ethnographic map of Poland was drawn up by Safarik for his general map published in 1842. Since that time a certain number of attempts have been made; but the Poles do not yet have a good, complete ethnographic map. Only a few frontier areas which have been the object of a detailed investigation are known in detail.

S.P. P. 101 The Polish domain constitutes in its entirety an irregular square included between Jablunkov, (1) in the Carpathians, Ujscie on the

1. In Silesia.

Notec, Suwalki and Sanok. In the north it is penetrated by a Kashub enclave along the left bank of the Vistula, between Danzig and the lake of Leba.

The frontier line begins in the southeast at the sources of the Moravka, a tributary which flows into the Ostravica at its right bank, and reaches the Oder near Bohumin. This line is disputed by the Poles and the Czechs in the area of Teschen, which the Czechs call /72/ Tiesin and the Poles Cieszyn. The localities of this region are in dispute between the two nationalities (1) and the question of the

1. We here suppress the names of localities which have no interest at all for the French reader. (Translator).

schools gives rise particularly to conflicts of a purely local character. According to the latest statistics, the Czechs are diminishing in this region, while the Germans and the Poles are increasing. The mingling of Czech and of Polish produces a sort of mixed dialect; it is only to the west of Ostravica that pure Czech is spoken.

In the German Empire the Poles are settled partly in Silesia, but especially in Poznan (in the districts of Poznan-Posen, and of Bydgoszcz, in German Bromberg), in East Prussia (in the districts of Danzig-Gdansk and of Kwidzyn-Marienwerder) and in Prussian

175
177 there; about 1700 they were in great measure Germanized; the last Slav group was that of the Dravani (Drawaina) in the district of Luchow which even today is called Wendland, country of the Wends.

1719 The Slavic language disappeared between 1750 and 1766. It was in 1751 that mass was celebrated in Slavic for the last time.[1]

161 In the years 1890-1900 the newspapers reported, according to A. Parczewski, that the census /94/ of 1890 had found 570 Slavs-Wends still in this region. But it was an error. The official census had indeed found in the Luchow area 570 Wends, but they spoke only German.

197 The Slavic tongue in this region has been dead for more than a century, as Mr. Muka reported without hesitation.[1] He was sent out as an investigator by the Academy of Sciences of Cracow.

000 However, the Slavic character is still found in great measure in the type and in the manner of life of the inhabitants of the Wendland.

101
175 Originally the Sorbs of this region[2] occupied in a compact mass all of the country situated between the Saale, the Verra*, the Fulda, the upper Havel, and the Spree. They extended as far as Frankfort on the Oder, on the Lower Bobra, the Hvizda (Queis). The group included the so-called Sorbs between the Saale and the Elbe (1) then the Lusatians

1. These Sorbs are designated in Latin texts of the Middle Ages by the name Sorabes. (Translator)

on the middle Saale, and the Milczani on the upper Elster, the upper Spree and the Neisse. From the eleventh century on, the Germans began to penetrate into these regions; but they only came there in large numbers beginning with the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. At this period the Sorb national group began to diminish to the west of the Elbe; it finally succumbed as a result of the Thirty Years War. The situation was better in /95/ Upper and Lower Lusatia, united under the Bohemian crown. Unfortunately, in 1635 the Treaty of Prague ceded
175 the territory to the House of Saxony. The Sorbian national group
668 commenced to decline, especially in Lower Lusatia. Its decadence was not arrested until the nineteenth century by the literary renaissance which restored some energy to this small people.

Thanks to the efforts of a few patriots, the national conscience

[1] [Wendland -- Analyst] [2] [Among the Polabian Slavs - Analyst]

161 German, one arrives at the figure of 116,810 individuals, and, if this figure is corrected according to the estimates of Parczewski, of Swjela*, and of Muka, about 156,000 persons are obtained, a lamentable total for a people surrounded and penetrated from all sides by the German flood. What favors Germanization is the extent to which the Sorbs [177] are economically dependent upon the Germans: the military service, preaching in German, the absence of an intellectual class, their complete isolation. The Sorbs who resist most energetically are those of Upper Lusatia, whose intellectual center is at Bautzen (Budysin). In Saxony, of 297 communes called Wends (1), according to the census of 1900, there are in all 225 with a Slav majority, and only 7 entirely Slav.

1. The Sorbs of Lusatia are called Wends in German.

167 We have no other data on the Lusatians or on their emigration. It appears that there are colonies in America (especially in Texas--Serbin (a town), which recalls the name of the nation, Giddingswenden (probably the town of Giddings), West (perhaps the town of West Point) Yewa (not located), Warda (a town), Burleson (a county) whose inhabitants left Europe towards the middle of the last century, and who still preserve the national tradition. There are also some in Australia (at Angerspark, at Adelaide near Melbourne). They are of more recent origin.

175 The great majority of the Sorbs are Lutherans; there are 15,000
162 Catholics, who live for the most part in the neighborhood of Budysin (Bautzen).

197 /98/ S 19. Differentiation.--Even though they are only a small
182 nation, the Sorbs are not unified from the linguistic point of view. The difference between the idioms of Upper and Lower Lusatia is so great that the common people have great difficulty in understanding one another and many linguists have recognized two distinct languages. There are in fact two literary languages founded upon the two dialects which are farthest apart (that of Kottbus and that of Bautzen) and two literatures. This duality creates a grave danger, the much more so as the two fractions are divided from a political viewpoint. Kottbus belongs to Prussia and Bautzen to Saxony. Aside from the language, the
101 two Lusatian groups differ from many viewpoints in matters of domestic
182 life and costume. According to Muka, the boundary between the two

1: Niederle--63 E-5 1911 E/C Slavic Peoples E/C
Sorbs
Czechoslovakia EB1

S.P. 101 122 areas formerly ran from Zagan (Sagan) on the Bobrawa through Muzakov, Grodk, Kolany, Kupsk (Muckenberg), Wikow (Elsterwerda) towards Bielagora (Belgern) on the Elbe, and it has remained in conformity with this line in matters relating to the Sorb population.

• • •

V

/99/ THE CZECHS AND THE SLOVAKS

S.P. C. 101 S 20.--Historical Introduction.---The Czechs also belong to the western branch, as well as the Slovaks, who, from more than one viewpoint, may be considered as forming only a single nation with them, even though fate has already separated them to a considerable degree and, judging by all appearances, should further enlarge this separation.

These two branches developed from a common center, which alongside the Polish and the Polabre center, was located somewhere to the north of the Sudeten Mountains and perhaps reached as far as Moravia; it is from this region that the ancestors of the Czechs and the Slovaks came into the regions where history verifies their presence.

S.P. C 174 [172] 101 They came there from the north, perhaps all together in a single move, perhaps at various periods. The texts contain nothing about this; archaeology, while admitting the Slavic and particularly the Czech character of the cinerary tombs of the Lusatian type, can only conjecture that Bohemia and Moravia were occupied before the middle of the first century B.C. /100/ The cradle of the Czechs and the Slovaks is to be found further to the north, but, taking into account archaeological data, one may to a certain degree regard them as being indigenous to Bohemia and to Moravia. The same may be said for the branch settled in Hungary. Dr. Czambel chose to state in recent times that the Slovaks did not come with the Czechs, that they came by themselves and from another region, from the southeast,--all this in order to demonstrate that the Slovaks do not belong to the western group, but to the southern group. But this theory lacks foundation from the viewpoint of history and of philology. The linguistic kinship shows without argument that the Czechs and the Slovaks belong to the same group as the Sorbs of Lusatia, the

S.P. C. 174 197 101

* [The Czechs and Slovaks — Analyst]

1: Niederle--64 E-5 1911 f/6 Slavic Peoples E/6
Czechoslovakia EB1

S.P. 177 [177] 101

Poles, the Polabes, and that they carried out their migration at the same time as these.

The Czecho-Slovaks, after having crossed the Sudeten and the Carpathians, settled at first in the north of Bohemia, of Moravia, and of Slovakian Hungary; to the south there were settled Gallic, Illyro-Thracian tribes, later on also the Germanic peoples of the Marcomani and the Quadi. After the departure of these allogenes, the Slavs spread not only over the territory on which they are established today, but even much farther to the south. This applies to the Czechs of Bohemia and Moravia and also to the Slovaks of Hungary; the latter still have numerous islands /101/ in the counties of Esztergom, of Budapest, to the south in those of Bars* and of Nograd, and positive indications prove that formerly they extended much farther toward the south in the areas in which they encountered colonies of Slovenes and Bulgars.

To the east, it is difficult to determine the ancient frontiers. Their delimitation by the Vah, the Hron, and the Tepla rests only upon hypotheses. However, we do know that the frontier in those days did not extend as far as today,--that is, almost as far as the Tisza. For the greater part of the western Slovaks are made up of Russians assimilated during the historic period. To the north the Polish Gorals (Mountaineers) had penetrated across the mountains in the regions of Trencin, of Orava and of Spis. In the north the frontier followed the Sudeten Mountains (the regions of Sluknov and Friedland were Sorbian (1)

1. Of course this refers to the Sorbs of Lusatia; see the preceding chapter 1/1 (Translator).

and composed the district of Zagozd*). In Silesia, the region of Opava was Czech. In the west, the Czechs, in the twelfth century, when their written history began were beginning to penetrate across the Bohemian Mountains (Boemerwald, in Czech, Sumava) as far as Bavaria and in the south even beyond the Danube. How far did they go into Pannonia? Did they indeed settle there, they or the ancestors of the Slovaks? This cannot be ascertained with certainty. /102/ In all likelihood, they went at least as far as Lake Balaton, as is vouched for by the history of the princes Pribina, Kocel, and Svatopluk. (1)

1. About these persons, consult my work on Cyrille et Methode (Paris, librairie Franck, 1868).

Like the other Slavic peoples, the Czechs at first did not form a single nation. We know little of the internal situation in Hungary

1/1 [cf. cat. 116, pp. 58-63 -- Analyst]

1: Niederle--80 E-5 1911 EK Slavic Peoples E16
Czechoslovakia EB1

S.P. C. 178

have almost entirely disappeared. Since the second half of the nineteenth century, modern civilization, the school, the obligatory military service, and similar factors have unified them more and more. It is only in Moravia that there still is some slight variety, but it will disappear even there.

S.P. C. 177 101 184

Three principal dialects are recognized in Bohemia: those of the southwest, of the center, and of the northeast. But they do not afford accentuated characteristics which render them immediately recognizable. In contrast, here and there ethnographic islands are met with, which, from the point of view of language and of costume afford special interest and are distinguished by particular names. Thus, not so long ago in the west the area of Plzen and in the east that of Litomysl with the dialect of Orlice had a special physiognomy.

Likewise in the southeast the Blataki (from Blato, swamp, lake, in the area located between Sobieslav* and Trebon*) can be distinguished, and in the region southwest of the Sumava, the Chodes*, the most typical of all of the Czech tribes (1), which were /127/

1. A few notes on the Chodes will be found in my volume, Le Monde slave (2d edition, Paris, 1897, p. 200). Translator.

formerly settled between Domazlice and Tachov, and which are now concentrated around Domazlice, the Tachov area having been partly Germanized. It is in the area of Mount Rip that the true type of Czech peasant is to be found.

The odd character of the Chodes has given rise to the most diverse theories regarding their origin. Formerly Paul Stransky*, and later Ruffer, Erben, Grabowski, suggested that they were Poles settled as colonists by Bretislav I. But their dialect offers not the slightest trace of Polish influence. The uniqueness of the Chodes is explained sufficiently by the mountainous and isolated region which they occupy, by their traditions and the privileges which they have enjoyed since the fourteenth century as guardians of the frontiers.

The origiality of the primitive tribes is better preserved in Moravia. There we may very easily distinguish three different types, not only by dialect, but by physical and ethnographic details, particularly by the costume; even more, the people themselves are conscious of these differences and glad to affirm them. Up until now the things which have been most clearly recognized are the

1: Niederle--81 E-5 1911 E/6 Slavic Peoples E/6
Czechoslovakia E 81

SP. dialect and the costume. The other signs of differentiation have not
C been studied from a scientific viewpoint. We have noted in the first
197 place, that in the mountain regions of Bohemia and of Moravia there
101 exists a purely Czech element which in the south borders upon
184 German territory.

/128/ In the northeast of Moravia and of Silesia the Lasi are met with (their country is called Lassko); they occupy the region of the Opava and the Czech section of the Tesin (Teschen) area, and in Moravia the area in which are situated the towns of Pribor, Brusperk*, Moravska, Ostrava, Frydlant, etc. The name of Lasi, furthermore, is not commonly used among the people. One finds alongside it those of Valasi* and other local names, Horale*, Kozloviane*, Dulani*, etc. The dialect of these Lasi bears strong traces of Polish influence.

The Valasi, properly speaking, are settled to the south of the Lasi in the region of Vsetin. From a linguistic viewpoint their idiom is very close to that of the Slovaks. But the people distinguish themselves very definitely from the latter, and their dress is completely different.

They are a group of purely Slovak origin who have been given the name of the Rumanian Walachians, who from the eleventh to the twelfth centuries moved into the Little Carpathians and were assimilated by the natives.

The most unusual tribe is that of the Moravian Slovaks, formerly identical with the Slovaks of Hungary, but who are today entirely different from them in life and in customs. In Moravia there remains only a small group of 18 villages which preserves the Hungarian character.

C
[E92] Among the Slovaks of Moravia, the national costume still persists in all its brilliance; it /129/ is so varied that an ethnographer has been able to distinguish 28 absolutely different types.

SP
C
101 Pure-blooded Slovaks occupy the southeast corner of Moravia. To their groups are attached three former Croatian villages, which they have
184 assimilated.

All the rest of Moravia belongs to the Hanaks*. Just as the Slovaks are lively and cheerful, the Hanaks are calm and apathetic. Their center is located on the river Hana, a tributary of the Morava which gives them their name.

S.P.C. 181 184

Their principal towns are: Prerov, Olomouc (Ollmutz) and Prostejov. They are divided into the Red Hanaks and the Yellow Hanaks, according to the color of their breeches. Various tribes are recognized among them: those of the Baniaks*, of the Blataks*, of the Zabeczaks*, of the Moravicks*, names which refer to certain details of topography.

S.P.C. 101 184 177

The Slovak territory can be divided up only on a theoretical basis. From the dialectological viewpoint, it divides itself into three areas: that of the west on the Nitra and the Vah, that of the center (upon the Hron and upper Vah), that of the east which reaches from Gemer* and Liptov as far as the national frontier. The inhabitants of this area are considered by many ethnographers as Slovakized Russians, and it is a fact that in the counties of Spis, of Sarys*, of Zemplin and of Ujgorod (Ungvar) the Russians are becoming more and /130/ more Slovakized. One of the most remarkable of these groups is that of the Sotaks* in the county of Zemplin.

They are so called because they say so instead of tso /co, what/ and have nothing to do with the Satagues* of Jordanes.

S.P.C. 101 184

Let us also mention as local names those of the Magurani* in the county of Spis, of the Trpaci* in that of Niredhazy*. Among the Slovak groups, the most unusual is that of the Detva, in the county of Zvolen: a Hungarian ethnographer, O. Hermann, chose to see in the Detvanci colonists from Hercegovina, but he is mistaken.

S.P.C. 101 184 463

The ancient ethnographers, and, following them, many modern books, indicate as forming special tribes those persons who work as peddlers, broom-makers, galziers, etc., who merely represent nomadic types common to all nationalities.

However, representatives of certain industries are natives of certain regions, for example, the dratenici, sellers of articles made from iron wire, are natives of the county of Trencsin, etc. (1)

1. Likewise in France, certain artisans are especially natives of the Creuse, the Auvergne, of Savoy, etc. Translator.

S.P.C. 184

What is of much greater interest from the Czech viewpoint than these local shades of difference, is the distinction which exists between the /131/ Czechs and the Slovaks of Hungary. This distinction arose a long time ago; it has been sanctioned by a long separation; the

1: Niederle--83 E-5 1911 Slavic Peoples E16
Czechoslovakia E81

S.P. C. 184 Slovaks broke away from the Bohemian crown in 1031; despite the relations which they have maintained since that time with the Czechs, and many attempts to bring them more closely together, the separation persists and, except for an unexpected miracle, it will finally lead to the division of the formerly single nationality into two different nations.

S.P. C. 175 182 [197] During long centuries, the Czechs and the Slovaks of Hungary, even though they spoke different dialects, had neither the same costumes, nor the same customs, and were living under different sovereigns and in different states, were nevertheless not conscious of these differences. Their literary representations proclaimed the unity of their language and rejoiced in it.

Attempts have been made in these latter days to demonstrate that the Slovaks were of a non-Czech origin, that they have merely been Czechized by the influence of religious literature, and that the divergences which have recently occurred were only a return toward an ancient state of affairs.

S.P. C. [197] This thesis, which was that of Czambel, recently deceased, is not sufficiently well-founded. What is certain, on the contrary, is that the Slovaks and the Czechs at the outset formed an ethnic and linguistic unit with some /132/ dialectal differences, a unit which occupied the region located to the south of the Sudeten and Carpathian mountains. But this common domain was divided by the Carpathians into two regions, one of which had its center to the west, the other to the east. These geographic conditions gave birth to two political organisms. The Danube, which was their natural bond, fell into the hands of the Germans. In 1631 the Slovak areas were detached from Bohemia and from Moravia. The religious and literary ties between the two groups in no wise succeeded in reuniting the broken bonds.

The differences between the two peoples grew more and more pronounced. Among the upper classes the idea developed that they belonged to different states, to another fatherland, that they had a different ideal of autonomy. These ideas were expressed for the first time in 1787 and towards the end of the first half of the nineteenth century, at the period when the Slovak literature broke away from the Czech literature.

Beginning with this period the Czechs had to reckon with this

1: Niederle--91 E-5 1911 E6 Slavic Peoples E16
Slovenes E7

S.P. Sl. 163 181 167 In the matter of the birth rate during these latter years it has been very low in Carniola; between 1890 and 1900, 1.84%; the birth-rate for Austria taken all together is 9.44%. Between 1880 and 1890 the coefficient was 9.44%. For all of the Slovenes taken together the coefficient is only 1.37%.

Therefore, the development of the nation appears to be arrested. This phenomenon is due in part to denationalization, in part to emigration, and in part to inexact census figures.

S.P. Sl. 162 [796] From the religious viewpoint the Slovenes are almost entirely Catholics (99.9%). In respect to occupations, 75.4% devote themselves to farming, 13.4% to industry, 3.5% to trade, and 7.7% to public services.

S.P. Sl. 197 101 S 28. Differentiation.--From a linguistic viewpoint there are rather numerous differences; but they are not very deep (see what is said further along regarding the dialectology of the southern Slavs). To designate the various groups within the nation, the Slovenes usually give themselves geographic names, borrowed from their political boundaries: Kranjci (Carniolians), Primorci /145/ (people of the seacoast), Korosci (Carinthians), Goricani (Goricians), Styrians, or names of an even more local character, borrowed from the orography and the hydrography. In Styria there are singled out the Pohorianci, the Polianci of the Mura and of the Drava, the Halozanes, in Carniola the Gorenici (people from above), Dolenici (people from below), and the Notranjci who speak different dialects. To the north of the Mura, the Prekmurci (Transmurians) present an interesting type. In the northwest of Istria the Savrini or Bresavi are also pure-blooded Slovenes, as are the Berkini in the north of Istria. On the contrary the Fucki in the outskirts of the town of Buzet (Pinguente) and the Cici are Croats of the kaikavski and cakavski dialects. (1) Likewise, the White Krainici--so called from their costume--who are settled between Kocevje and the Kupa River are also of the kaikavski dialect.

1. Although certain philologists attach the Kaikavci of Croatia to the Slovenes, we relegate them to the next chapter; they consider themselves to be Croats.

A very interesting group, particularly studied by Professor Beaudoin de Courtenay (2), is the group of Resians established in the

1: Niederle--92 E-5 1911 Slavic Peoples Serbs EF6 Slovenes EF7 Croats EF4 EF6

S.P. Sl. 177 101 [184]

2. A Pole, despite his French name, Mr. Beaudoin de Courtenay today lives in St. Petersburg. Translator.

Friul, in the neighborhood of Udine. They are crossed with /146/ Serbo-Croatian blood and perhaps with another, which explains why their language is divided into four dialects. These Slavs of the Friul are settled in eight purely Slovenian communes of the district of San Pietro, in three communes and several mixed localities of the districts of Taranto, Cividale, Gemona and in the purely Slavic commune of Resia (district of Moggio--German, Reschenscheideeck). Beaudoin de Courtenay estimates that the Slavs of the districts of Gemona and of Tarcento are Serbo-Croats, those of Stara Gora and of Cividale are Slovenes; according to him the inhabitants of the district of San Pietro are Slovenes crossed with Croats and Resians, the product of the mixture of a non-Aryan people with the primitive Slavs.

S.P. Sl. 144

1 A

• • • • •

/147/

VII

THE CROATS AND THE SERBS

S.P. Cr. Sb. 101

§ 29. Historical Introduction. --The Croats and the Serbs belong like the Slovenes and the Bulgars to the south Slav or Yugo-Slav family (1). They formed at the outset a single group, which history has divided into two sections, into two nations, the Serbs and the Croats. Both of these two nations, even though they are conscious of their kinship, lay claim to an autonomous life.

1. Yugo means south. Translator.

Cf. Sl. S.P. [197]

Even formerly there existed distinctions between the various sections of the future Serb unit and the future Croat unit. But these distinctions were not deep ones. They consisted of dialectic shades of difference, the organization into different tribes, distinct political outlooks, etc.

S.P. Cr. Sb. 174 [197]

At the beginning we find ourselves in the presence of an aggregat of tribes belonging to a single group, belonging to a single linguistic type with very slight differences; this group left its early homeland in the region of the /148/ Carpathians, moved towards the Danube, then the Dra the Sava and the Balkan peninsula. The various tribes settled over a considerable extent of territory, without geographic unity; they were separated by the mountains; they communicated with each other with

1 A [i.e. Resians in the Friul -- Analyst]

S.P. Sb. 3 3 167

between Serb territory and Bulgar territory. The nationality of the inhabitants of this region has been for a long time a matter of controversy. But since the Serbs have occupied it and have brought to it their civilization, it can no longer be differentiated from the Serbian group. According to Mr. O. Brosh, an analogous phenomenon occurred in the south, in the section of Serbian territory called Old Serbia.

S.P. Cr. Sb. 101

S 30. Territorial Boundaries.--

The Serbo-Croats are divided today among several states. The Croats belong entirely to Austria-Hungary. In fact, they occupy the Slavic section of Istria and of the seacoast, a section of Dalmatia and of Bosnia, all of Croatia and Slavonia, with the exception of Srem (Syrmien), and are scattered besides in western Hungary. The Serbs have their principal nucleus in the Balkan peninsula. They are settled in the independent kingdom, in Bosnia-Hercegovina annexed to Austria, and in a section of Dalmatia, in the independent principality of Montenegro, in the northern sections of the Turkish vilayets of Scutari (Skadar) and of Skoplje, in the north of Slavonia, and they /157/ form sizeable islands in South Hungary.

Because of the great size of the area over which they are scattered, their boundary is poorly defined and it is difficult to trace its outline. It is still more difficult to trace the boundary which separates the Serbs from the Croats. This is how one could mark it approximately: It starts out at the little stream of Dragonja and from the Croat town of Buzet (Pinguente), where the Croats of the two dialects kaikavski and cakavski meet the Slovenes and the Italians; then the border runs down to the south and passes into Istria through Beram (Vermo), Vodnjan (Dignano), and reaches Pula (Pola), then it follows the seashore of the Adriatic as far as the Bojana, which runs into the lake of Skadar (Scutari). Certain cities, Rijeka (Fiume), Zadar (Zara) are in great measure inhabited by the Italians. On the other hand, Sibenik, Trogir (Trau), Split (Spalato) are Slav. However, there are in the Kvarner (Quarnero) islands some Italian localities.

S.P. Cr. [97]

From the Bojana the line which separates the Serbs from the Albanians runs through the middle of the lake of Skadar (Scutari) and passes to the south of the frontier of Montenegro through Sutorman, Vila, Gusinje, Plav, near Pec /Ipek/, then below Djakovica, Prizren, it reaches Mount Chardagh and Mount Karadagh and comes to Vranje

S.P. Sb. 101

and the other Slavs than between the Serbs and the Croats. The two groups coincide in the matter of the zadruga (communal holding of rural property), and in matters where considerable differences are to be noted, for example in the arrangement of houses, the boundary line of difference does not coincide with the Serbo-Croat frontier. The Roman type with a single hearth predominates in Montenegro, while in Dalmatia, in Hercegovina, and in the other areas the High German type with two hearths predominates.

According to Weissbach, the Serbo-Croats present the following characteristics: tall stature, strong preponderance of the dark type, especially in Bosnia-Hercegovina, strongly brachycephalic and of an extremely large cranial capacity. The cephalic index is an average of 84 (85.7 among the Bosnians and the Croats of today). The cranial capacity is 1,524. There are 93.5% brachycephalics and 6% mesocephalics. Weissbach concluded that the Serbs and Croats should be considered as forming one and the same people. Recently Mr. Zupanic declared that physical differences exist between the two national groups; but it is uncertain, at the present stage of the science, whether his statement can be justified. From the language point of view, the south Slav group in the west splits up as follows: the Čakavci (1) being identified with /175/ the Croats, the Stokavci with the Serbs, and the Kajkavci with the Slovenes. Miklosic still distinguishes a Serbian tongue and a Croatian tongue. But it is proven today that this distinction has no basis.

1. These groups are thus named on the basis of the manner in which they say or pronounce the relative pronoun. /rather, pronominal word ca, sto, kaj, meaning "what". Editor./

Nevertheless, we should point out some dialectical shadings which are not in accordance with the political distinctions. Alongside the two great dialects of Stokavci and Čakavci, there are other transitional dialects: the Kaikavski of the west, toward the Slovenes, the dialect of Prizren or of Timok, otherwise called "Old Serb", and the Svrljiski dialect to the east toward the Bulgars. Several eminent philologists, notably Belic, relate the Kaikavstina to the Slovene tongue. According to the recent studies of Mr. Resetar, the Kaikav territory is separated from the other two by a line which starts from Turnovac, on the Drava, reaches Virovitica, runs around Bjelovar, goes to Trnovitica, Jasenovac on the Sava, follows the Sava as far as Belaj, then runs to Trzic, Plaski, Brlog, Nin (Nona) and Zadar (Zara).

[i.e. Serbs and Croats -- Analyst]

S.P. Cr. Sl. 177 [178] 101

Towards the south, the Kajkavci have penetrated into certain localities in the territory of the Cakavci. Cakavci was spoken on the seacoast at one time, as ancient documents attest. Here is how this change of dialect is explained: at the moment of the Turkish invasions the inhabitants emigrated en masse towards the north and when they returned later on they had learned to speak Kajkavci. Those who speak the purest /176/ Kajkavski live between Zagreb (Agram), Varazdin, and Krizevac.

The territory of the Cakavci today comprises the greater part of the Adriatic islands, some Dalmatian villages, and the Croatian seacoast as far as the Kupa River.

The most extensive dialect is the Stokavski: in the area located between Vidin, Sofia, and Kyustendil, it is changing under the influence of the Bulgar dialects, and in the southwest, between Vranje and Prizren, under the influence of the Macedonian dialects. There is a whole group of types of speech still little studied, which by certain signs are akin to the Serb group, by others to the Bulgar group, which have been the subject of numerous discussions among philologists and among statesmen. This transitional region of the dialect which Belic calls the dialect of Timok and of Prizren, begins at the Danube at the mouth of the Timok, runs up towards the districts of Nis and of Vranje, Krusevac and Prizren; it divides itself into sub-dialects which bear the name of these localities. According to Belic and Resetar, the eastern frontier of this dialect starts at Ulcinj, goes through Prizren, Janjevo, Prokuplje, Stalac, Zaicar, and returns again to the mouth of the Timok on the Danube.

The secondary groups are composed of the Bunjevci, especially the Sokci in the Backa. We know very little about their origins and not very much more about their political character. They are claimed equally by the Croats and the Serbs. /177/ The Bunievci speak the Stokavski dialect. Another colony is settled in the county of Krasso on the upper course of the Karas (about 7,500 persons). The former ethnographers, Czoernig, Schwicker, Hunfalvy, Dobrovsky, Miklosich, and Drinov, took them for Bulgars. L. Miletic proved recently that their language and their origin are equally Serbian, that their language belongs to the Stokavski dialect, but that it is rather different from that of the Serbs of the Banat. Syrku was mistaken when he pretended

Serbs E/C
Croats E/C
Montenegrins E/C

S.P. Cr. 97 101

to see them as an entirely independent tribe. All are Catholics. No one knows when they arrived. But they probably have been here since the fifteenth century. The latest statistics show them partly as Serbs, partly as Croats, and the Croats also claim them.

Here are still a few other groups. The purely Kajkavski inhabitants of the zupaniate (1) of Zagreb in the western region, between

1. Prefecture.

Samobor and Zumberk, call themselves Prigorci (mountaineers), those who live near the sources of the Kupa, Brajci; one also finds in the neighborhood of Zagreb the names of Berzjaci, Puhovci.

Istria is especially interesting from the viewpoint of such groups. In the north one first meets the Fuckovci who speak Kajkavski and who are so called because of the whistling manner /178/ in which they speak; to the south are the Cicovci, descendants of a Bosnian colony which came in 1532; in the southeast the old Istrian Cakavci distinguish themselves clearly from the later Stokavci colonists who came from Dalmatia and from the ancient Romans, called Vlasi or Morlaci by their neighbors. In Istria, the Rumanians /Romans?/ still maintain themselves in the villages of Zejani, Brda, Grobnik, Iesenovik, Sutnjevica, Lelaj and Nova-Ves. According to the latest statistics the pure-blooded Rumanians form three groups, one of 389, another of 516, the third of 217 persons.

S.P. Cr. Sb. [563]

S.P. Sb. 101

In Serbia a large number of local names has sprung up, borrowed from those of rivers, of mountains, of areas, and of towns. (1) Their

1. We shall not translate them. Translator.

origin is not difficult to trace. In Hungary the ancient name of Rasciens, inhabitants of the Raska, an ancient Serbian province has been kept for the Orthodox Serbs.

Local names have developed also in Bosnia from the names of towns and areas. (2)

S.P. Sb. [563]

2. There are in Bosnia a few groups of Roman origin, who still speak a Romance language. But the greater part declare themselves to be Serbs. They are called Cincari, Achani.

S.P. M. 161

Montenegro has preserved the former division into tribes, whose names are still known by the people. Beginning in the north, one

1: Niederle--114 E-5 1911 E/CSlavic Peoples E/C
Bulgaria EE1

S.P. B. 101 174

and the Slovenes and they did not form a united group. Still in the seventh and eighth centuries we find in the eastern part of the Balkan peninsula an entire series of tribes very slightly united to each other, the Sieveriens and seven anonymous tribes in the north of the present Bulgaria, the Rumeliot Slavs, then the Druguvicnes, /183/ the Smoliani, the Strumenci, the Rynchini*, the Sagudati*, the Berziti in Macedonia. It is evidently to these latter that the Slavs who pushed into Greece and into the Archipelago are related from the linguistic viewpoint, the Velegezites, the Vajuniti, the Milingi, and the Iezerci. Towards this period a union began to develop, but under foreign pressure. In 679 under the leadership of Asparukh a certain number of Bulgars from the Volga--of Turkish origin--crossed the Danube and penetrated into the Dobrudja as far as Varna; they subjugated the neighboring Slavic tribes, unified them, and little by little unified all of the Slavs of the center of the Peninsula.

S.P. [197]

On the other hand, the Bulgars of the Volga, who were relatively few in number, became themselves assimilated very quickly with the Slav element and merged with it. (1)

1. Zanetov and Skorpil thought that they found the remains of these ancient Bulgars among the Gagauz (see further on) and among the Turks of Deliorman between Silistra, Shumla (now Kolarovgrad), Varna and Rushchouk, whom their Bulgar neighbors called Gadjaly. Mochkov came out against their hypotheses.

Their name alone, which was given to the new state and to its people, recalls the memory of this element of foreign race. Besides the Bulgars have basically always been Slavs, even though they have not hesitated to assimilate foreign elements. Among these elements, along with the Turkish Bulgars, one must cite the remains of the ancient Thracians, the Germans, /185/ especially the Goths, Turks, and Avars, to whom were added later on other Asiatic elements; the Poles, the Cumaeans, the Oguzes, gypsies, and finally the Osmanli Turks.

S.P. B. 175

The Bulgarian Empire, beginning with the reign of Simeon (893-927) acquired a considerable area; it grew by means of the constant warfare with Byzantines on the one hand and with the Serbs, on the other. The Slavs who belonged to its most remote frontiers at

1: Niederle--118 E-5 1911 E16 Slavic Peoples E16
Bulgaria EE1

S.P. B. 167

previous Bulgar population did not date back further than one hundred and twenty years.

To the west of the Iantra* there are very few old villages and many new ones founded by the immigrants who have come from the areas of Lovech and of Sevlievo. These new populations were distinguished from the old ones by traditions, costume, and especially by dialect. On the other hand, there were many new immigrants to the south of the Balkans in the areas of Burgas, Aitos, and Yambol.

ooo Therefore, the Bulgar country has been the theater of perpetual movements, and definitive order will not be reestablished there until the Macedonian question has been finally resolved. However, the solution of the Macedonian problem is constantly delayed by the neighboring powers.

S.P. B 101

S 34. Territory Occupied by the Bulgars.---It is bounded on the north by the Danube, from Cherna Voda to Vidin and then by a line which runs from Vidin through Tsar-Petrovo, Boinitsa and Shchichintsi, to the Serbian frontier. From this line at Vidin there runs off a narrow section which goes up as far as Novo Selo on the Danube. The western boundary follows the Timok which serves as the political frontier between Serbia and Bulgaria. But the philologists are not in agreement upon the characteristics of the intermediate dialect of the area of Pirot-Vranje. Belic assigns it to Serbian, Tsonev to Bulgarian and considers only as intermediate the dialect of the Morava and the Resava. As we have already explained, in the basin of the Timok, in the area of Pirot, Nish, Vranje and Prizren a dialect intermediate between Serbian and Bulgarian is spoken. But, leaving aside the dialectic shadings which are of no importance from the viewpoint of nationality, and bearing in mind the other factors which determine national consciousness, it cannot be said that the boundary of the Bulgar national group follows the Timok and runs up towards Nich and Vranje, as Tsonev would have it, but that it starts from Veliki Izvor on the Timok, that it follows the ridge of the Stara Planina (Mountains), otherwise known as the political frontier, as far as Mount Kom; then it passes between Pirot and Caribrod (now Dimitrovgrad), crosses the Ruia Planina (Mountains), passes near Vlasina and reaches the upper Morava at Vranje. Then it follows the road from Nich to Skoplje, runs around that city and runs across the eastern spurs of Mount Chardagh towards the Debar (Alb., Dibra).

S.P. B 197

1: Niederle--127 E-5 1911 E/6 Slavic Peoples E/6
Bulgaria E E1
S.P. B. 796 101

They have settled by preference in the Rhodope (Grk., Rodope), where they constitute a rather large group between Plovdiv and Salonica. They are met with here and there to the north of the Balkans in the region of Lovech, Pleven (Plevna), especially between the Vid and Panega Rivers, to the south of Pleven. In the Kingdom of Bulgaria their number has greatly diminished; for, as a result of their Turkish sympathies, they have since 1878 been in perpetual conflict with the other Bulgars. The latest statistics numbered 20,644 of them in Bulgaria, of whom 17,055 were in the district of Plovdiv (Philippopolis) and 2,837 in that of Pleven.

S.P. B. [871] 212

From the viewpoint of education, the Bulgars are not very much advanced, which is explained by the difficult conditions in which they have lived, deprived of all the advantages of civilization. They are now making an effort to make up for lost time. According to the latest statistics the number of literate persons in the principality was an average of 28.4%. The districts may be placed in the following order:

Ruse 38.5%; Shumla 35.9%; Varna 34%; Trnovo /205/ 34%; Plovdiv (Philippopolis) 29.6%; Burgas 29.4%; Sofia 28.8%; Stara Zagora 28.3%; Pleven 23.1%; Kustendil 20.1%; Vidin 19.8%; Vratsa 19%. The highest degree of education is found naturally in the regions of the great cities: 60% at Sofia, Ruse, and Varna; 49% at Plovdiv; 47% at Kotel and at Shumla; 37% at Kazanluk. The least literate areas are those of Radomir (20%), Tsaribrod (now Dimitrovgrad) (19%), Kyzilagatch (19%), Berkovitsa (16%), Kula (14%), Belogradchik (13%), Ferdinandovo (13%).

S.P. B. 197 101

S 38. Internal Differentation.--The Bulgars are divided into three groups from the point of view of language.

1). That of the western dialect: it is bounded on the east by a line which starts from the confluence of the Vid and the Danube and runs towards Salonica across the regions of Nikopol, Pleven, Lovech, Teteven, Pirdop, Novo Selo, Panagyurishte, Ikhtiman, Chepino, Rezlog, Nevrokop, Melnik, Petrich, Demir Hissar (now Siderokastron), Seres, and Salonica.

2). The eastern group is divided into two branches:

A. That of the northeast where the people bear the general name of Zagortsi (Mountaineers), or Khertsoi*, or Poliantsi*.

B. That of the southeast, or branch of the Rhodope, whose

S.P. B. 1977 101

representatives are called the Ruptsi, the Rupalani; their nucleus is located between Stanimaka /206/ and the sources of the Arda in the area called Rupchos. The boundary between these two eastern groups is given as the chain of the Balkans and of the Sredna Gora (central chain). But this boundary is crossed alternately by the two dialects. The other limits thought up by the philologists are not in very close agreement with each other and it is impossible to decide which is the most accurate. Tsonev draws a line from Burgas through Yambol and Stara Zagora to Pazardzhik; Miletic, from Adrianople to Plovdiv along the Maritsa (with spear-heads towards Chirpin and Kotel).

To the west the dialect of the Rupci goes as far as Chepino. Evidently, before the invasion they reached as far as the Balkans and to the Sredna Gora and constituted the most powerful southern tribe. There is no agreement either regarding the boundaries of the western dialect. According to Miletic it runs as far as Pazardzhik (in the region of Schopi").

S.P. B. 101

Among the Bulgars of the three groups, there exist many secondary groups provided with special names and distinguished by customs, traditions, local names or dialects. Thus the inhabitants of the mountainous regions of the Balkans are generally called Balkantsi, those of the Rhodope Mountains (in Bulgarian Rodopska Planina) Planintsi (1), those of the valleys of Sofia, of Kustendil, of Kratovo, Poliantsi, Poltsi, and Polchene. (2)

1. Planina means "mountain" in Bulgarian. Translator.

2. Pole means "field". Translator.

/207/ The Bulgars of the south call the Bulgars of the north the Zagortsi (the people across the mountains), and the Bulgars of the north call them the Otvedentsi (the separated ones). But we find Zagortsi from the north in the neighborhood of Aitos and of Burgas. Miletic notes from the east to the west the following designations borrowed from the names of localities: Erkechani (Erkech) (now Kozichino), Golichani (Golica), Chengentsi (Chenge), Richani (Rich), Kotlentsi (Kotel), Tichani (Titsa), Bebrovtsi, Bebroveni (Bebrovo), etc. The people from Rumelia receive surnames borrowed from their place of origin: Odrintsi (from Odrin or Adrianople), Yamboltsi (from Yambol), Starozagortsi (from Stara Zagora), etc.

In Bulgarian Macedonia one encounters an infinite number of

B. 101 district of Benderj, where they are concentrated in the outskirts of Komrat. Mochov estimates their number at 70,000; but in the official statistics they are considered to be Bulgars. According to Zanetov the Bulgarian Slavs of Bessarabia should be called Tukani.

S.P. B. M1 [197] /211/ From an anthropological viewpoint, the best documented specialist, Mr. Vatev distinguishes a certain number of groups in the Bulgar nation. But up to the present these groups have not coincided with the linguistic groups. What is certain is that the east differs from the west, noticeably from the region of Sofia and of Macedonia, and that the south offers characteristic traits.

Basing himself upon the measurements of 320,000 school children, 36,000 soldiers and 1,330 skulls, he arrived at the following conclusions regarding the Bulgarian type:

This type is of medium height: 1.665 millimeters for the men, 1,567 millimeters for the women; dark complexion predominates (50 % against 5% light blond; the remainder mixed). But it must be noted that the dark complexion predominates in the east, while in the west and in Macedonia, which formerly was the center of the Balkan Slavs, the dark type is still rare. The Bulgars have a regular nose, high eye sockets, and an erect head. As to the shape, there are 77% mesocephalics (index 75-80). The average index among the soldiers is 79.65 (in Macedonia 79.45) and among the skulls 77.97.

The dolichocephalic types are found especially in the south, the brachycephalic in the west; in the south of Macedonia the average index exceeds 85.

S.P. C.M. 101 648 S 39. The Slavs of Macedonia.---As we have already mentioned, the Slavs of Macedonia and of Old Serbia are claimed /212/ by both the Serbs and the Bulgars.

Let us note at the outset that it is not well known where Macedonia and Old Serbia begin and end. Thus, the Bulgars attach to Macedonia the regions of Skoplje, Tetovo, and Koumanovo; on the other hand, the Serbs attach Skoplje and Tetovo to Old Serbia; some of them lay claim even to Prilep, Bitolia, Ochrida, and Veles; all of these claims, of course, have a political objective.

Macedonia and Old Serbia represent the country bounded, roughly

S.P. C.M. 648 exaggerated claims, without counting Turkey which is today the proprietor of the contested territory, without speaking of the Great Powers, especially Russia, Italy, and Austria, who have their eye on Macedonia.

000 From all of this whirlpool of literary, political, and scientific endeavors, a disinterested observer can draw today only these obvious conclusions:

S.P. C.M. 181 1). The Slavs of Macedonia and of Old Serbia represent a people whose national consciousness is not yet completely and equally developed, if we compare them with the two neighboring nations. However, it is beyond doubt that the largest portion of this people S.P. C.M. [795] feel themselves and proclaim themselves to be Bulgars, that they belong to the independent Bulgarian Church, whose head is the Exarch resident at Ortakioi. (1) On the other hand, it is certain that the

1. According to Brankov, there are in Macedonia 77% Exarchists and 23% Patriarchists. According to Hilmi, the proportion is entirely different. See above in Section 37.1

name Bulgars is an historic name in these regions and that it has not been brought in through the religious propaganda of these recent years. Even though these regions were once annexed to the Serbian State, yet the name Serb has not taken root among the people. This is why in recent times the Bulgarian propoganda, both ecclesiastical and political, has found a very deep response throughout the country; Serbian propoganda has a chance of future success only in the northern region which is in contact with the Serbian Kingdom and has direct dealings with it; this region is Old Serbia.

S.P. C.M. ● 197 2). From a philological point of view it is true that the language of the Slavs of Macedonia presents an aggregation of local dialects rather distinct from one another. They form a sort of idiom which is intermediate between the Serbian stokavski and the Bulgarian language proper. (1) But taken altogether and in certain details it is much more

1. See Section 32, above.2

S.P. C.M. [194] [193] closely related to the Bulgarian than to the Serbian. These special traits are the use of the postpositive article (used after the substantive), the loss of declension and the retention of the nasals. Only the dialect of the northern region is more closely related to the dialect group of Vranje, Nish, Timok, which Professesor Belic assigns to the domain of the Serbian language, but certain philologists do not agree with him.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

ethnic or national self-consciousness and restricted the capacity of Slavic peoples either for self-government or for a resolute national effort in the critical moments of their evolution. Even those Slavs who live closest to the centers of European civilization and who shared its progress for centuries have often been debarred by economic and political factors from the enjoyment of a full national life, and those more distant from these centers have emerged from the Middle Ages only during the last 250 years. In the light of these facts, it is not surprising that the Slavs have often seemed an enigma to the Western world.

By virtue of their geographical distribution, the modern Slavs fall naturally into three distinct groups: Eastern, Western, and Southern. Of these, the Eastern is the most numerous. It embraces the Russians, who comprise two-thirds of the Slavic complex, and subdivide linguistically into three sections: first and most important, the so-called Great Russians, inhabiting the central and northern districts of European Russia; second, the White Russians (and here "White" has no political connotation whatever, but means light-haired) who occupy the area which borders on the northern part of the former eastern frontier of Poland, and, while centering in the neighborhood of Minsk, also run over into former Polish territory as far as Grodno, Bialystok, and Brest-Litovsk; and third, the so-called Little Russians (otherwise known as Ukrainians or Ruthenians), who inhabit the black-earth prairies or steppes north of the Black Sea from the western frontier to the Kuban and Don rivers. The Ukrainians, as present-day newspaper readers know only too well, also inhabit not only Volhynia and Eastern Galicia as far west as Przemysl, but also the extreme eastern tip of the former republic of Czechoslovakia, known as Subcarpathian Russia (now Soviet territory), and likewise make up a considerable part of the population of Bukovina (now also Soviet), an area which formerly belonged to Romania and which lies just south of the former Polish-Romanian frontier.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

It was to this district, centering about the city of Czernowitz, that many Polish officials and soldiers withdrew to escape German and Russian pursuit when Poland was invaded in 1939.

The Western Slavic group includes the Poles, the Czechs (or Bohemians) and Moravians, the Slovaks, and two Slavic islands in German territory: the Kashubs, who live on the Baltic coast northwest of Danzig, probably not over two hundred thousand in number, and a considerably smaller number of Sorbs, or Wends, who inhabit Lausitz, or Lusatia, a small area on the upper Spree river northeast of Dresden.

The Southern Slavs are cut off from their northern kindred by the Austrian Germans, the Magyars, and the Romanians, but comprise the Slovenes in the extreme northern part of Yugoslavia; the Serbs and the Croatians, who differ from one another only in slight variations of dialect and by the fact that the Serbs belong to the Greek Orthodox church and use the Cyrillic Script (similar to the Russian), while the Croatians are Catholics and use the Latin alphabet; and the Bulgarians who, though possessing a Slavic national language, represent a complex fusion of racial and linguistic stocks.

In view of the numerous and violent migratory movements which took place in northern Europe both before the Christian era and during the first few centuries after it began, the Slavs are hardly likely to have occupied their present extensive territory during their whole recorded history. On the contrary, their migrations cover a range almost as vast as those of their Germanic neighbors, and the location of their primitive habitat constitutes a problem which has long engaged students of Slavic history and linguistics.

The earliest native tradition dealing with Slavic origins is contained in the so-called Russian *Primary Chronicle*, a compilation completely extant only in two fourteenth-century texts, but which reproduce with considerable accuracy a work composed by a monk of Kiev about the end of the eleventh century. Here we read:

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

174 114 *Sclaveni* and *Antae*," and adds elsewhere, "Though deriving from one stem, they have now adopted three names, that is, Venethi, Antes, and Sclaveni." The "Ravenna Cosmographer," an anonymous geographic work not later than the seventh century, mentions the *Sclavini* as living in Scythia, which is here a generic term for northeastern Europe, while the ninth-century Latin text known as the "Anonymous Bavarus," with the full title "Description of the cities and regions on the north bank of the Danube," speaks of the *Zeruiani* (the name is obviously related to the modern terms *Serb* and *Sorb*), "which is so great a realm that from it, as their tradition relates, all the tribes of the Slavs are sprung and trace their origin."

Such of these sources as belong to the sixth century or later obviously reflect a period when the Slavic dispersion had already begun, but they are interesting as early datable appearances of the name *Slav* and as a sound basis for identifying Wends and Slavs as the same people.

174 197 Linguistic evidence also impels us to place the Slavs north of the Carpathians before their dispersion. Old Slavonic not only shows traces of contacts with Thracian, Iranian, and Germanic, but is also closely related to Lithuanian and exerted some influence on the early Finnish vocabulary. The only area where such extensive relations could have developed must necessarily have been north and east of the Carpathian chain.

174 141 It is likewise true that such anthropological evidence as we have identifies the proto-Slavs rather with the northern long-headed race than with the primitive Central European brachycephalics, though even at the epoch of Slavic unity the cephalic index was by no means uniform, and with the lapse of time the stronger shortheaded brunette type came to dominate among the Slavs, as it does indeed today.

174 114 The topological nomenclature of the Carpathian range is, moreover, not Slavic, thus indicating that the early Slavs lived beyond these mountains and the forests which clothed them. Furthermore, Herodotus mentions as adjacent and subject to

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

be the dwellers along the banks of such a river or in the marshy area thus postulated. In the primitive habitat of the Slavs there are rivers with names related to a base *slav-* or *slov-*, and much marshland, but nowhere has a name been preserved which is of sufficient importance to justify the assumption that it was the starting point for the term *Slovĕne* which, despite its mystery, has been applied to all Slavic subdivisions, whatever their location, since the sixth century A.D.

Like the Germanic dialects, the Slavic languages belong to the so-called Indo-European linguistic family. It so happens that we are familiar with a series of languages which begin to appear about 1000 B.C. from Hindustan to the Atlantic and from Scandinavia to the Mediterranean basin, and which exhibit so many common features that they may safely be considered to have a common origin. Along with the Germanic and the Slavic languages, this family includes Indo-Iranian (i.e., Sanskrit, the various later Indic dialects, and the several forms of Persian), Baltic (Lithuanian and Lettish), Albanian, Armenian, Celtic, Greek, and Italic (among the latter, besides Latin, the idioms of several other tribes speaking kindred tongues). The Baltic and the Slavic languages have so many striking resemblances that many philologists believe in a long period of Balto-Slavic community before the two branches separated and pursued individual paths of linguistic evolution. Of these two branches, the Baltic, especially as represented by Lithuanian, is the more conservative, hence evolved more slowly, and exhibits linguistically a more primitive character than Old Slavonic, despite the fact that our oldest Lithuanian text dates from the sixteenth century, while our oldest Slavic texts go back to the tenth.

While it is customary, for linguistic reasons, to postulate a uniform primitive Slavonic or proto-Slavonic tongue, this term should not be taken to mean that even at the dawn of their history the Slavic tribes over the whole extent of their habitat spoke a language identical in phonology, inflection, and vocabulary. It is rather to be supposed that the germs of dialec-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

tal differentiation inherent in the proto-Slavonic language even at the epoch of closest ethnic unity evolved into conspicuous local characteristics as the race gradually spread. By the ninth century A.D., when a Slavonic tongue was first used for literary purposes, the differentiation of the several Slavonic languages and even of the dialects in each was a consummated fact of some centuries' standing.

By their very location, remote from the centers of classical culture and bordering to the west, south, and north upon tribes to which it did not penetrate until the beginning of the Christian era, the Slavs, jutting out toward the confines of Asia in a region almost devoid of natural boundaries and barriers, were inevitably exposed to the repeated impacts of alien nations from the Orient. Destined later to form a part of the great medieval trade route from the Baltic to the Black Sea, the river Dnieper, along which the easternmost portion of the primitive Slavs lived, was likewise a promising area for penetration from the north. The Slavic occupation of western Russian territory, if the identification of Herodotus's Neuri as Slavic is correct, reaches well back toward the beginning of the first millennium before Christ. The earliest historical neighbors of the Slavs in the Russian prairie country were thus the Cimmerians, whose land, according to the *Odyssey*, was always veiled in fog and darkness, for there the sun never rose nor set. Actually they were an eastern offshoot of the Thracians, who centered in the basin west of the Carpathians until they were displaced by Germanic and Celtic invaders. During the second millennium and until the eighth century B.C., the Cimmerians extended eastward beyond the Crimea and the Sea of Azov, and to them belong the scanty remnants of bronze culture found in South Russia and dating from the beginning of the first millennium before Christ. The barrier erected by the Cimmerians to a Slavic advance toward the Black Sea was later perpetuated by the Scythians, who form the first wave of Oriental nomads to sweep across the black-earth region in historical times.

The Scythians are, in fact, the earliest inhabitants of south-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

ern Germany was settled by other Germanic peoples, especially the Goths, who were present on the shoreline as early as the fourth century B.C. At any rate, in the first two Christian centuries, we find them definitely on the lower Vistula north of the Slavs. During the second century A.D. some migratory disturbance, or perhaps even the casual exploration of watercourses followed by a desire for more fertile territory and for commercial relations with the Black Sea littoral once a route thither was discovered, induced a considerable number of the Goths to move out eastward across the Bug to the basins of the Pripet and the Dniester. At some point during this movement, perhaps in Volhynia, one section split off from the main Gothic body and, after passing down the Dniester, subsequently appeared in Dacia as the Visigoths, who fought against Caracalla's troops in 214 and crossed the Danube in 248. According to the tradition preserved by Jordanes, the rest passed over the Dnieper and finally reached the coasts of the Black Sea and the Crimea.

Since the Goths remained masters of the western steppe country from the second century A.D. until 370, when they were overthrown by the Huns, they were thus the Germanic tribe with whom the proto-Slavs had the closest and most lasting relations, reflected in a considerable number of loan words in the common Slavic vocabulary. These words may be classified in groups which clearly demonstrate along what lines Gothic influence upon the Slavs was most incisive. They include an ···ensive list of military terms (armed band, helmet, armor, sword), commercial words (usury, debt, earring, purse, búy, kettle, plate, sack, camel, vinegar, glass), agricultural items (plow, stall, vineyard, cattle, garden, donkey, fig, bread), and names of learned professions (doctor, scribe). Some of these words point also to the probability that this borrowing either did not take place until, or at any rate was still taking place during, the period when the Germans were in close contact with the Roman Empire and had themselves already borrowed some terminology from the Latin. In any event, these words

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

must have become ingrained in the Slavic vocabulary before 400 A.D., and made their entry into the common speech prior to the spread of the Southern Slavs into the Balkans, which began about a century later.

While for 200 years the Goths were the dominant ethnic element in southern and western Russia, they constituted only a numerically inferior ruling class which controlled the Slavic natives and such Iranian elements as were left from the period of Scythian and Sarmatian supremacy. It would otherwise be difficult to explain the process by which the Goths disappeared completely from the steppe country during the two centuries after the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom by the Huns in 370. The Huns themselves were a Turko-Tartar tribe whose western movement, begun in the first century A.D. after 300 years of strife with the Chinese in southern Mongolia, brought them to the Caspian Sea in the second. They were a nonagricultural nomadic people possessed of little culture of their own. What civilization they exhibited, and particularly their military organization, they borrowed from their Sarmatian vassals. Some of the Ostrogoths joined the advancing Huns. That portion of the Gothic population which had settled in the Crimea, though also subjected to the Huns, disappeared more slowly, and some small remnants preserved their Gothic identity as late as the eighteenth century. While the authority of the Huns does not appear to have been oppressively exercised in the steppe country, it nevertheless dealt a fatal blow to the flourishing civilization composed of combined Oriental and Greek elements which had adorned the north shore of the Black Sea for nearly a millennium. The Huns were the last Asiatic people to impinge upon the eastern section of the Slavs before their dispersion and expansion.

The primitive social organization of the early Slavs is, it must be admitted, a highly controversial subject. An exclusively patriarchal and tribal organization is found, after all, only among purely nomadic peoples, but is immediately re-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

The Slavs were curiously tenacious in retaining their own language, but extremely receptive to manners and techniques transmitted to them through contact with superior cultures. When they were present in a majority, they experienced no difficulty in impressing their language on the indigenous minority, whom they Slavicized rapidly by intermarriage. The Dalmatian coast from Veglia to Ragusa experienced this evolution from the ninth to the last century. On the other hand, remnants of the old Romanized pre-Slavic population, known as Vlakhs, persist in the interior of the peninsula to the present day, especially in southern Macedonia and the Pindus, while the Romanians, in spite of Slavic and Turko-Tartar admixture, are a concentrate of Romanized pre-Slavic native elements. Of the indigenous and un-Romanized population prior to the migrations, the Thracians in the eastern half of the peninsula disappeared altogether, while the Illyrians in the western half survive fractionally as the Albanians. The linguistic differences between Serbian and Bulgarian have sometimes been explained by the existence of an Illyrian substratum in the former, and a Thracian in the latter, since the areas occupied by the new vernaculars correspond roughly to the regions occupied by these two pre-Slavic elements. Of the migrant tribes who preceded the Slavs into the Balkans no trace remains. The Celts had passed from the scene before the Slavs arrived. The Sarmatians, driven into the Balkans from the steppes, were known as early as the fourth century only by scanty place names. A few Germanic islands kept their names until the fifth century. The Huns rapidly dissolved after Attila's death, while the Avars, after the Slavs threw off their yoke, were decimated by their wars with Charlemagne before the year 800, and the remnant was absorbed by the adjacent Slavs.

Though we find in the Balkans an uninterrupted set of Slavic dialects gradually shading into each other, from the Adriatic to the Black Sea, the three basic literary languages (Slovenian, Serbo-Croatian, and Bulgarian) are well-differentiated vernaculars. It is not to be supposed, however, that this

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

differentiation originated after the dispersion. On the contrary it may be assumed that the germs of dialectal differentiation inherent in the proto-Slavic language even at the epoch of closest ethnic unity evolved into more conspicuous local characteristics as the race gradually spread. It seems probable that the sections of the proto-Slavs whose vernaculars were the precursors of the present South Slavonic languages were geographically placed in their original habitat in an order corresponding to their present locations. The Slovenes are the furthest northwest of the modern South Slavs. It would appear, then, that their proto-Slavic ancestors lived in the southwest corner of the proto-Slavic habitat on the upper Vistula. Similarly, the ancestors of the Serbo-Croatians must have lived in the vicinity of the central Carpathians (there is, in fact, some etymological relationship between the words *Carpathian* and *Croatian*). The proto-Bulgars lived further eastward and seem to have descended the Prut and the Seret rivers toward the lower Danube while the western proto-Slavs came through the Sudeten passes into Bohemia and Moravia.

The forefathers of the Slovenes, after crossing the Danube soon after the beginning of the Christian era, first appear in history after 592, when they attacked the cities of Istria and northern Italy and made war against the Duke of Bavaria in modern Styria. They were dominated by the Avars early in the seventh century, and after the Avars were dispersed fell first under Bavarian and then (788) under Frankish sovereignty. Then as now their settlement was most dense in southern Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, though their zone of occupation contracted appreciably under German pressure as time went on so that the northern Slovenian border was pushed south from the Danube to the Drave.

The Croatians and Serbs make their appearance in the western half of the Balkan peninsula south of the Slovenes somewhat earlier than the historical debut of the latter. They were thus reported along the coast at Salona in 536 and at Durazzo in 548. Their starting point was apparently the Vistula valley,

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

than 1167, and long before that date the process of extermination or assimilation had set in.

In view of the latest developments in modern history, let us pause a moment on the origins of the Czechoslovaks. The primeval habitat of Czechs and Slovaks was located north of the Carpathians between the headwaters of the Oder and the middle Vistula. The Czechs reached Bohemia and Moravia by the upper reaches of the Neisse and Oder and westward through the Sudeten range and between the Gesenke and the Jablunka. The Slovaks, on the other hand, arrived in their present location between the Morava and the Danube by passing the western Carpathians (that is, the Beskids and the High Tatra south of modern Krakow). The western limits of the Czechs were thus the Böhmer Wald and the Erzgebirge, while on the north they enjoyed a good natural frontier in the mountains from the Sudetens to the Carpathians. On the south the Bohemians and Moravians originally extended to the Danube, but were gradually pushed back along the river between Linz and Vienna until the twelfth century, though the Slovaks maintained contact with it at Bratislava (Pressburg). The western Slovak limit is still roughly the river Morava, which joins the Danube about thirty miles east of Vienna.

There is no longer much question but that the Czech and the Slovak languages were originally an identical dialect just as their speakers were primitively one group, but even in modern times there is an appreciable diversity of dialect, culture, and character among various sections of even the Czechs themselves, and the present differentiation of the Slovaks was conditioned and intensified by geographical separation from the Czechs and by the long-standing political dominance of the Magyars since 1029. The intellectual gap between Czech and Slovak is also due to the rapid Czech assimilation of German culture. Finally, at the extreme east end of the state of Czechoslovakia is an area known as Subcarpathian Russia. Its inhabitants speak a Ukrainian (Little Russian) dialect per-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

known to have kept a garrison at Kiev, it is even probable that the name of that city is of Khazar origin, that is, *küi*, "bank of a river," and *ev*, "settlement," which well accords with the lower part of the city as it still is today.

On the north and the east, the Eastern Slavs were eventually confronted by Finnish tribes. We have relatively little data on the primitive habitat of the Finns, but modern scholarship places it in the extreme eastern section of northern Europe, on the edge of the Ural mountains and even further eastward. They were thus concentrated from earliest times in the basins of the rivers Oka, the Kama, and the middle Volga, and it is from this nucleus that they spread westward to the Finnish Gulf, occupying not only Karelia and modern Finland, but also the southern shore as far as the Gulf of Riga, hence modern Esthonia and much of present-day Latvia. In central Russia their line of settlement extended as far west as modern Moscow, where they were in touch with an original Lithuanian population which has long since disappeared. Indeed, since these Lithuanian elements occupied a line running from the Baltic to the neighborhood of modern Smolensk and Kaluga, the actual contacts of Eastern Slavs and Finns cannot have begun until the Slavs themselves had already crossed the northern Dnieper and advanced toward the head of the Desna, and until the Finns themselves had begun to move westward toward the Baltic. This view is confirmed by the fact that it is only in the extreme north and east of the Russian area that Finnish linguistic influences are perceptible.

While there are some tribes known to Herodotus who may have been Finns, the Finns themselves are first mentioned with certainty by Tacitus, who did not think very highly of them, since he speaks of their remarkable ferocity at once with their sordid poverty, adding that they lived on herbs, dressed in skins, slept on the ground, and defended themselves with bone-tipped arrows. Jordanes, the Gothic historian, knew some identifiably Finnish tribes as subjects of the Goths. Our now familiar source, the Russian *Primary Chronicle*, composed after

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

into genuine trading posts and towns, the importance of which was enhanced by the penetration of foreign merchants at the beginning of the historical period. The rise of trading posts and towns gradually concentrated adjacent agricultural areas under the control of the former, producing at the same time accumulations of wealth in the hands of a new ruling class which appropriated to itself the influence formerly wielded by the elders of family, clan, and tribe. The growing prestige of the towns also broke down the various tribal differentiations, since portions of the same tribal area might fall for reasons of geography and communication under the control of different towns.

In general, the Russian tribes formed three groups distinguishable by their speech, which are reflected in our day by the tripartite division of the Russian language into three basic dialects. The northern group, comprising the Slovenes (Slavs) of Novgorod and the Krivichians, is the forerunner of the modern Great Russian dialect, the standard literary language. The central group, including Dregovichians, Radimichians, Vyatichians, and Severians, divided into two sections, of which the eastern joined the northern, or ultimately Great Russian element, while the western section (Dregovichians, Radimichians) came to form the White Russian element centering around Minsk. The southern group, made up of Polyane, Derevlians, Volhynians, Ulichians, Tivercians, and Croats, evolved into the Little Russian or Ukrainian element. In fact, the term *Ukraina* goes back as far as at least 1187, and meant the southern border district. The differences among these three dialects have of course been intensified as time went on by the accidents of political affiliation and by diversified cultural influences. But these three groups are none the less parts of the same nation, so that either a White Russian or a Ukrainian is precisely as much a Russian as the purest Great Russian born in the shadow of the Kremlin.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

III

Conversion and Religious Divisions

While conversion to Christianity was an inevitable phase of the process by which the Slavs were drawn into the general movement of European civilization, it was by no means an unmixed blessing. When Slavic tribes had evolved to some semblance of national consciousness and even statehood, or were sufficiently remote from the center where religious influence was exempt from political pressure, they were able to retain their independence and to follow a characteristic course of development. But if they lived on the periphery of a powerful and aggressive Christian state, their political independence was frequently threatened, and if this state cherished colonial aims, the convert Slavs were very likely to face the choice between assimilation and enslavement, or, at the very worst, complete extermination.

The section of the medieval church which brought about the conversion was also a factor of durable historical weight. The Western Church was devoted to the tradition of Latin culture. It insisted on the celebration of the Mass in the hallowed language of the Church. Hence it evinced little concern for the creation of any vernacular culture. Though not possessed of the same vitality, the Eastern Church soon found that it could evangelize the various pagans on the long Byzantine frontier more effectively if it allowed them to use their native languages

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

in the service. Hence, though much of early south or east Slavic literature is either translated or imitated, the fact remains that the Slavs under Byzantine intellectual and religious influence developed significant national cultures much more rapidly than those under the domination of Rome. That these cultures, after a brilliant initial spurt, were later retarded and even brought to a halt which lasted several centuries is due, not to the source of conversion itself, but to historical accidents which supervened after conversion took place. Had not the Eastern and the Southern Slavs fallen victims, in one case to Tartar invasion and in the other to Turkish conquest, their intellectual lag in comparison with the rest of Europe would not have been so great. The Russians, for example, were completely deprived of all Western stimulation after the middle of the thirteenth century and nearly three hundred years elapsed before they entered upon the difficult process of assimilating the Western culture which had developed during that long and critical interval. The South Slavs, on the other hand, shook off the Turkish yoke only within the last century and thus were even more handicapped than the Russians in their struggle to catch up with the modern world.

Of all the Slavs, the Slovenes in Carinthia and Carniola were the first to encounter missionary activities. Early in the seventh century, they had been temporarily combined with Czechs and Sorbs north of the Danube in the semilegendary kingdom under Samo, who led them victoriously against the Avars and simultaneously offered a temporary barrier to Frankish expansion southward. During his declining years in Switzerland, Saint Columban, the great Irish missionary, had thought, as early as 612, of setting out from Bregenz on a mission to the nearest Slavs, but, finding the task too difficult for his advanced age (he was already sixty-nine), he retired to Italy and ended his days at Bobbio.

After Samo disappeared from the scene and his realm was dissolved, the Slovenes were unable to withstand the Avars, who soon held the Danube as far as the Enns. The Slovenes

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

imperialistic views on Constantinople with a policy which would necessarily favor revolutionary movements among the Slavs and compromise the gospel of his legitimism. Nevertheless, Marx, Pokrovsky and Tarle gave, as we saw, striking examples of this Machiavellism of Russian policy. Let us, however, analyze the doctrine itself and try to see what were the concrete historical and cultural realities which it had to face. We saw that one of the chief problems, that of Russo-Polish relations, has not been and could not have been solved within the frame of Slavophil or Panslavistic schemes. But what was the general picture?

The main argument of unity among the Slavs was of course that of language. The Slavic languages belong to the same family and it is not difficult to prove that certain similar phenomena which appear in different Slavic languages represent not a result of inter-Slavic influences but an independent parallelism of development. For the tenets of the Slavophil doctrine the fact of a common linguistic origin meant very much theoretically. Language is an expression of the relationship between man and the universe, and therefore this expression reveals a—let us say—philosophical outlook. In other words language possesses an ideological value. On the other hand history differentiated the Slavic peoples. During long centuries they went sometimes not only through different but very often even opposite and contrasting cultural influences; and because of that the languages in their turn also differentiated to such a degree that Slavs are no longer able to understand one another. The amusing point here was the fact that the Slavophils of the various Slavic nations used German in order to communicate with each other. This was indeed a paradoxical situation for those who were trying to unite themselves first of all against Germanism. Of course Russia was and still is suggesting that the Russian language be accepted as the common language for the Slavs. But this generous offer has not so far been adopted. The linguistic divergencies become even more salient when we leave the field of language proper and try to apply the methods of unification to the field of belles lettres,

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

especially poetry, even if it be the popular poetry. A synthesis appears absolutely impossible. It would be enough to compare the Czech versification and all the changes it went through with the Russian and Polish to see how great are the differences. Let us take the Russian *byliny* with their assonances, which have no correspondents in other Slavic productions. On the other hand the *Shchedrivky* and the *Koladki* are ritual poems often inspired by historical subjects of a purely Ukrainian character. A quite distinct group is represented by the Serbo-Croatian and Bulgaro-Macedonian popular poetry—heroic rhapsodies which sing of the legendary Serbian hero Kralević Marko, the mother of the Jugović and her sons and many others. This poetry which served the fantasies and mystifications of Mérimée, which enchanted Goethe, Pushkin, Mickiewicz and Nodier, represents a quite special formation and a unique genre in the Slavic world. How different is the medieval Polish poetry, only semi-popular in its most distant origins, with its origin in the Church. Its lyrical starting point is to be found in the *Kyrie Eleison* and *Alleluiah*, refrains of liturgical songs.

Let us abandon for a moment this purely philological statement and turn to a more essential factor which determined the historical development of the Slavic nations: I have in mind religion. Religion divided the whole Slavic world into two parts. Bulgarians, Serbians, Great Russians, Ukrainians, and White Ruthenians embraced Eastern Orthodoxy from a Byzantine source. Czechs, Croatians, Slovenes, Slovaks, and Poles embraced the Catholic religion from its Roman Source. And in addition the Czechs went through Hussism; a part of the Ukrainians and White Ruthenians adopted the Union. The Muscovite Slavophils and Panslavists were fighting against Catholicism. By that very fact they were in opposition to the whole Western Slavic world. Religion determined the cultural differentiation, and if we add to that some other historical factors we shall see that at the time when Russia was under the influence of Byzantium, of the Bulgarian and Serbian messianistic literature which formed her

728 the USSR; the Polish and Kashubian sections of Germany passed to Poland; some Slovenian and Croatian dominions of Italy to Yugoslavia; and a part of Dobrudja was returned from Rumania
162 to Bulgaria. The total number of Slavs in the world is now over
198 200 million. Except for a few border minorities and Americans with Slavic mother-tongues, all Slavic peoples, save the Sorbs, live in states with a Slavic majority and state language—USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria.

● 197 Between the three Eastern Slavic languages there are intermediate dialectal areas. Russian is divided into Northern, Southern and transitional (Middle Russian) dialects, each of them with archaic islets presenting salient common features. Ukrainian dialects are classified into Northern, Southeastern, Southwestern, and Carpathian groups; the marginal dialects (called Rusnak) of the latter group are Slovak-influenced. Byelo-Russian is divided into two dialects—the Northeastern and the Southwestern, disclosing a stronger Polish impact. Polish contains, besides various border dialects, two fundamental groups: Great and Little Polish in the Northwest and Southeast respectively. Kashubian comprehends two types of dialects: the Southern, and the Northern, which includes Slovincian. In Czech there are Bohemian, Central Moravian, and Silesian groups, with transitional dialects from group to group and from Czech to Slovak and to Polish. Slovak consists of three dialectal types: Central; Western, closely linked with Czech; and Eastern, connected with Polish and Ukrainian. Slovenian exhibits great dialectal variety. Serbocroatian from East to West presents three basic groups: Štokavian, Čakavian, and Kajkavian which is transitional to Slovenian. Bulgarian is divided into three basic dialects: Western, Northeastern, and Southeastern. Macedonian sets up a scale of intermediary dialectal zones between West Bulgarian and Štokavian.

PROTOSLAVIC; EXPANSION

PROTOSLAVIC (Primitive Slavic), which substituted (1) *s*, *z* for advanced *k*, *g*, and (2) *x* for the old *s* preceded by *i*, *u*, *r*, *k*, was a Western offshoot of the satem-group of Indo-European languages

and shares the fusion of *a* and *o* with the majority of this group. 197
Common isoglosses testify a close and prolonged neighborhood with Germanic, Iranian, probably Thraco-Phrygian and foremost with Baltic, which is tied to Slavic by significant innovations both in vocabulary and in grammatical and phonemic, especially prosodic, features. Old loan-words from Iranian pertain mostly to spiritual, and those from Germanic to material culture. Contact with Altaic and Finno-Ugric languages seems to be confined to the late stage of Protoslavic and has left but scanty vestiges in its vocabulary. The long evolution of Protoslavic, which took around three millennia, can be traced up to its final stage—the entrance of the Slavs onto the historical scene (fifth–sixth centuries), [175]
the oldest foreign records of Slavic proper and common nouns (fifth–seventh centuries), the formation of the first hereditary Slavic states (ninth–tenth centuries), the appearance of Slavic [538]
written literature (ninth century), and the final dissolution of the Slavic linguistic unity toward the beginning of our millennium.

The territory of present-day Poland, Byelo-Russia, and North- 175
western Ukraine seems to exhibit perceptible vestiges of the oldest Slavic settlements. According to the first detailed literary accounts about the Slavs, the sixth century A.D. witnessed a strong Slavic expansion to the South, West, and East. The Slavs swarmed over the Peloponnesos during the seventh century, but were eventually driven back from Greece. With Charlemagne began the protracted retreat of the Slavs in the West and the gradual Germanization of the Elbe and Oder basins in the Northwest and of the Slavic regions of Bavaria and Austria in the Southwest. In the tenth century the Southern Slavs became separated from the Western because of this continuous German offensive toward and the Hungarian intrusion from the East; later they were cut off also from the Eastern Slavs by the extension of Rumanian. While the expansion of the Western and Southern Slavs was curtailed and even repelled during the early Middle Ages, that of the Eastern Slavs has never stopped and particularly their colonization of the East still continued, checked only in the Bering Sea area in the late nineteenth century.

9: Jakobson L-4 (no date) 1955 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

HISTORY OF THE LITERARY LANGUAGES

538
197

SLAVIC LITERARY ACTIVITIES begin in the ninth century with the rise of the first Slavic national state, Great Moravia, where two Byzantine missionaries brought up in Macedonia (Salonika), St. Cyril (Constantine the Philosopher, an erudite polyglot, formerly professor at the University of Constantinople) and his brother, St. Methodius, organized in the 'sixties a national church with services in Slavic. For this purpose they translated the Bible, liturgic and other ecclesiastic texts into the Slavic dialect spoken in the Salonika region, patterning it after the Greek model and adapting it to the Czechoslovak linguistic habits of Great Moravia. Since the dialectal differentiation of the primitive Slavic language at that time was insignificant, there were no obstacles for the spread of this Macedonian vernacular among the great majority of the Slavs as their first written and liturgic language. The literary activities of the two Slavic apostles were preceded only by a few primary Christian texts (such as the Baptismal Vows, the Paternoster, Credo, etc.) translated probably in Great Moravia in the early ninth century, partly from Latin, partly perhaps from Old High German, and preserved in later copies. The Moravian mission was forcibly terminated in 885, after some two decades of work, but it had given the Slavs many standard translations from Greek and occasionally from Latin, as well as original homilies, legends, prayers, and poems in a new but highly elaborate literary language adaptable for scholarly and poetic expression. Moreover, it bequeathed to them the lasting idea of the propriety and the necessity of using the mother tongue for all, even the highest, cultural purposes. This literary language, called by modern scholars OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC (Old Slavic, or inaccurately Old Bulgarian), penetrated from the late ninth to the eleventh centuries into the whole Slavic world except for its Northwestern margin. It produced several local variants: the MORAVIAN recension itself is known to us only indirectly through later copies made in other areas, the BOHEMIAN recension, which exhibits Latin influence, is preserved as far as indigenous manuscripts

9: Jakobson L-4 (no date) 1955 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

are concerned, in single fragments of the tenth and eleventh centuries, and moreover local literary activities are known through some later foreign, mostly Russian, copies; the MACEDONIAN recension, particularly conservative in its vocabulary and phraseology; the BULGARIAN recension, which weeded out Greek and Moravian words and expressions, created a new rich terminology, and reflected the intense scholarly and literary life of Bulgaria in the early tenth century—these last two recensions are preserved in several manuscripts of the eleventh century and in many later copies; the CROATIAN and SERBIAN recensions, both manifesting a strong Macedonian influence and attested by twelfth century manuscripts; and the Eastern Slavic (usually called RUSSIAN) recension offering the oldest of the dated Slavic manuscripts preserved, Ostromir's Evangelium (written in 1056), as well as some twenty-five Kiev and Novgorod manuscripts of the eleventh century and numerous others of later date—copies of Southern and Western Slavic originals, and in a great part, local creations. This recension derived from the Bulgarian but later tended rather toward the Macedonian and in its further development has shown a repeated reciprocity with the Serbian recension. The Freising Fragments of the late tenth century in Latin letters seem to be a SLOVENIAN modification of Old Church Slavonic. During the twelfth century the language of Cyril and Methodius, wherever it appears in the Slavic world, is essentially modified; the Old Church Slavonic period ends and thenceforth we speak simply of CHURCH SLAVONIC.

With the Great Schism of 1054 and the First Crusade, Latin triumphed as the only liturgic and literary language for all of the Western Slavs and for the Western part of the South Slavic area. Of the Catholic Slavic peoples, only a part of the Croats preserved the use of Church Slavonic in liturgy and literature and spread this use during the thirteenth century, which in general was favorable to the renascence of Church Slavonic culture among the Southern Slavs. In the Czech state this use was abolished toward the beginning of the twelfth century, but its tradition contributed to the rise of a Bohemian vernacular literature in the late thirteenth. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, besides highly developed

538 197 belles-lettres, even Czech science and philosophy turned to the national language and adapted it to the Latin cultural pattern. Rich terminological dictionaries were elaborated; attempts at holding church services in the mother tongue were made, and under the Hussites they became a contagious precedent for the European Reformation. After a weakening of its foremost position in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, literary Czech resurged with the nineteenth century, exploiting the old heritage, borrowing from other Slavic languages (especially from Polish), and quickly adapted to modern cultural needs. The Polish literary language, which especially in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had been modeled on Czech (the language of the Polish world of fashion until the sixteenth century), reached a world status, first in sixteenth-century poetry and then in Romanticism. In the sixteenth century the Reformation inspired religious texts for the Slovenian, Sorbian, and Kashubian people in their mother tongues. The propaganda of the Counter Reformation, endeavoring to penetrate to the populace, and later the democratic tendencies of the nineteenth century reinforced these vernacular literatures. Particularly modern Slovenian scholarship and literature and their means of expression attained a high level. In both of the smallest of the Slavic speech communities striving for the literary use of their vernacular, the champion writers were American emigrants —the Kashub H. Derdowski (1852–1902) and the Low Sorbian poet Mato Kósyk (1853–1940).

During the whole of the Middle Ages the written literature of Greek Orthodox Slavs was prevailingly ecclesiastic and used Church Slavonic; lay documents and juridical texts, however, were written in the local vernacular. Secular literary works, such as fiction, chronicles, profane itineraries, etc., oscillated between Church Slavonic and the vernacular. Even though the last three centuries have strongly secularized Russian culture and strengthened the vernacular (Middle Russian) stratum in the literary tongue, its traditional hybrid structure, which differentiates Church Slavonic and folk components semantically and stylistically and distributes them in various ways, has remained the pivotal principle of modern Standard Russian and is still the main source of its

9: Jakobson L-4 (no date) 1955 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

unusual richness. The political conditions of the Moscovite period created two distinct variants of the Eastern Slavic literary language: the Great-Russian pattern on the one hand, and the Southwestern on the other, which, besides a Moscow influence, exhibited a Ukrainian and locally a Byelo-Russian ingredient and which, moreover, was somewhat occidentalized through the Czech and Polish intermediary. To overcome this split, the patriarch Nikon, after the incorporation of the Ukraine into the Moscow Tsardom in the middle of the seventeenth century, initiated a radical revision of the Russian liturgic and literary language along Kievan lines. This reform contributed to the gradual Westernization of Standard Russian which in different ways during the seventeenth century imported a large number of Polish and Czech words, and then under Peter, directly followed Germanic and later on Romance models.

After a rich development in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Church Slavonic literature waned in Bulgaria and suffered a decline in Serbia with the Turkish invasion, diffusing at the same time a Balkan influence on both Southern and Northern Russia's literary language and giving birth as well to a new, RUMANIAN recension of Church Slavonic which served as the literary and liturgic language of Rumanians from the late fourteenth to the eighteenth century. Toward the sixteenth century, even in the Ottoman court and administration, Balkan Slavic speech came into use. On the other hand, the spiritual life and literary language of Serbia in the seventeenth century underwent a still greater Russian influence, and in the eighteenth century the native recension of Church Slavonic was replaced by the Russian pattern. In that part of the Serbocroatian world which adhered to Western Christianity there appeared, partly under the influence of the Reformation, partly after the model of the Italian Renaissance, regional attempts at raising the vernacular to a literary language with a Church Slavonic tinge. The most fertile of these were the Dalmatian schools of poetry—the western one flourished in the sixteenth century, and that of Dubrovnik (Ragusa) in the sixteenth and seventeenth. But the modern standard language, unifying both Serbs and Croats, which developed during the first half of the

nineteenth century, was only sporadically linked with earlier attempts: it raised to literary usage a folk dialect of Herzegovina and emphatically rejected Church Slavonic or Russian ingredients and the influence of any older literary heritage. A similar populist tendency characterized the rise at the same period of modern literary Ukrainian which was first used in the burlesques of the very late eighteenth century, and in its further development oscillated between the Western (Polish-influenced) and the Eastern (Russian-influenced) variants. Both Standard Byelo-Russian and Macedonian modestly entered into literature in the nineteenth century and acquired civil rights—the former after the First, the latter after the Second World War. On the other hand, modern Standard Bulgarian, likewise formed during the nineteenth century after some isolated earlier attempts, strongly and consistently continued to borrow from Russian and particularly from its Church Slavonic stock. Toward the middle of the same century, the Slovaks, who had used literary Czech (somewhat adapted to their own habits), inaugurated their own literary language based on the Central Slovak dialect but patterned after standard Czech.

Church Slavonic perseveres as a liturgic language in several slightly distinct variants: Nikon's recension is used by Greek Orthodox Slavs (and—with somewhat stronger orientation toward the old Kievan tradition—by the Greek Catholics); the pre-Nikon, Great-Russian recension is followed by the Old Believers; the Croatian Roman Catholics, in so far as they use Church Slavonic, maintain their own recension, although since the seventeenth century they have incorporated a considerable Kievan strain.

In the Slavic standard languages, besides Greek influence, prevailing in the area of the Eastern Church, and Latin, predominant in that of the Western, there can be noted a strong Turkic lexical layer in Eastern Slavic and in the majority of Southern Slavic languages, and a German stamp on the vocabulary and phraseology of Slovenian and of Western Slavic languages and on the technical terminology of modern Russian. To some degree all the main Slavic literary languages in their recent phase bear French imprints. Neighboring languages have undergone an appreciable Slavic influence, principally in their vocabulary. This is particularly so

194 (G) a prosodic pattern based on opposition of rising and falling pitch both in long and short syllables, with word-accent appended to the rising pitch and, in its absence, to the initial syllable (while the Balto-Slavic prosodic pattern had tolerated the word-accent on the second mora of any long syllable and on the initial or final mora of the word).

194 During the second half of the first millennium A.D., the diffusion
197 of innovations within the vast Slavic area became slower, and in particular regional divergences in their temporal order gave rise to certain dialectal features. Differently treated are: prothetic semivowels; vowels plus tautosyllabic liquids and nasals; *ě* (called *jat'*, the reflex of *ē* and *oi*); on the one hand the clusters *tj* and *dj*, and on the other, the fricative *x* when preceded by certain front vowels and followed by certain back vowels ('progressive palatalization') and furthermore, *x* before the reflexes of *oi* ('second regressive palatalization'): either only this *x* or only *tj*, *dj* become hissing sounds; *j* after non-initial labials; *t*, *d* before *l* and nasals; velars before the reflex of *woi*; front vowels before dentals followed by back vowels; the prosodic variety of the accented syllables (long and short, both either falling or rising) which underwent diverse regional modifications and limitations.

Some of the local innovations within the final Protoslavic period serve (1) to distinguish Eastern Slavic (*tort* > *torot*, ъ in *tъrt* had the same treatment as the strong ъ before obstruents, *dj* > *ž*, *bdm* > *m*, initial *j* disappeared before *u* and under certain conditions before *e* becoming *o*), and (2) to divide it into two dialects—Northern (the affricates *č* and *c* coalesced) and Southern (*g* became fricative): North Russian derives from the former, and the other Eastern Slavic speech-varieties from the latter dialect. The difference between Russian and Ukrainian will come later, in the twelfth–thirteenth century, when the tendency to use a common phonemic pattern still persists, but the etymological distribution of these phonemes is already somewhat different (e.g., both Russian and Ukrainian at that time developed the same diphthong *uo*, with the same prothetic *v* in initial position, but in Ukrainian, *uo* originates from *o* before a dropped 'jer,' and in Russian, from *o* under a rising accent). The formation of Byelo-Russian as a

whole will not start until the fifteenth century with its strengthening Polish influence. 194 197

Some dialectal innovations within the final Protoslavic period are common to the whole Western Slavic group (*tj*, *dj* changed to hissing sounds; all the palatalizations of *x* gave *š*). Except the change of the final group *jōns* into *en* in the Slavic South, and *ě* in the West and North, there are no common, exclusively Southern Slavic innovations: some changes link Southern with Eastern Slavic (velars undergoing the second palatalization were changed into hissing sounds; after labials *j* gave a palatal *l*; *d*, *t* were los before *l* and *n* except in some marginal Slovenian dialects and in Pskov-Russian); some other changes link the Southern group with Czechoslovak or at least with its eastern variant now represented by Central Slovak. Certain mutations were undergone by the whole central Slavic area (e.g., change of *g* into a fricative, attested in Czech, Slovak, High Sorbian, Ukrainian, Byelo-Russian, South Great-Russian, and part of Slovenian). A wider spread of central isoglosses as opposed to a marginal pattern is the oscillation of 'ě' between *e* and *i* and the connected change of the tautosyllabic groups *on*, *en* to the back and front vowels of the lowest timbre (*u* and mostly *æ*) everywhere except in the Lekhitic, Bulgaro-Macedonian, and in a part of the Slovenian area: here 'ě' oscillates between *e* and *a*, while *on*, *en* became ъn, ьn; still preserved is the nasal component in the Lekhitic languages and in some border dialects of Slovenian and Macedonian.

The loss of the 'jers,' a feature which expanded slowly in the tenth–twelfth centuries from the Southwest to the Northeast of the Slavic world, was the last common Slavic mutation. Throughout the whole of the Slavic area the 'jers' were lost with one essential limitation: of the two 'jers' in the neighboring syllables, the last (called 'weak') was dropped but the preceding (called 'strong') changed into an unreduced vowel. The loss of the 'jers' destroyed the uniformity of the Slavic syllable—its openness and the harmony of its constituents—and therewith forced the prosodic reshaping of the Slavic languages. (1) *A*. Serbocroatian and Slovenian, and *B*. North Kashubian maintained or partly restored both distinctive features of Protoslavic word-prosody—pitch and quantity: type *A*

194 maintaining and *B* eliminating the quantitative opposition under
197 accent. (2) Having abolished the rising pitch, Czech and Slovak, except for some transitional dialects, automatically fixed the accent on the initial syllable and maintained free quantity. On the contrary, the Eastern Slavic area and Bulgarian, with the adjacent Macedonian strip, abolished quantity in favor of free stress (this evolution is bound up with avoidance of vocalic contraction, whereas the maintenance of quantity implies new long vowels due to contraction). The intermediary zone between the languages with free quantity and those with free stress now presents neither quantity nor free stress—the latter is stabilized on the penult in Polish, Eastern Slovak, and Rusnak, on the first syllable in Sorbian and Southern Kashubian, on the antepenult in Western Macedonian. Thus we distinguish languages (3) without free stress and quantity and (4) with free stress.

The latter two types have a higher number of consonantal phonemes and clusters, the former two, especially the first one, a greater number of vocalic phonemes. The liquids assume a syllabic function only in the phonemic patterns of types 1A and 2; Czech excepted, they participate in the quantitative opposition. Type 4 tends to reduce the number of vocalic phonemes in unstressed position (e.g., to four in North Russian, to three—*u*, *a*, *i*—in South Russian and Byelo-Russian); type 1A reduces the phonemic inventory of velar consonants (mostly losing *x*, and in some Slovenian dialects even *k* and *g*). Only types 3 and 4 tolerate double consonants. Before losing the weak 'jers,' all Slavic dialects, except 1A, maintained the difference between ъ and ь and between the preceding consonants—palatalized before front vowel but not before back vowel. With the loss of the weak 'jers' this consonantal difference became phonemic, but in various ways was then gradually eliminated by 1B and 2, whereas the whole area 4 and most of the intermediary area 3 preserved or even strengthened this opposition. Except Slovenian and Kashubian, the languages which either did not develop or lost palatalization (softness) as a distinctive feature, acquired in different ways a fourth, palatal series of stops besides the labials, dentals, and velars (particularly so in Serbocroatian, Czech, and Slovak). Except for Slovenian,

Serbocroatian, and some Bulgarian dialects where ъ and ь in strong position coalesced into *o* or *a*, the strong ь in all languages became *e*, while ъ changed to *o* in the whole Eastern Slavic area, in Macedonia, partly also in High Sorbian and Central Slovak; everywhere else it changed to a corresponding unrounded vowel which later in 2 and 3 (but never in 4) coalesced with *e*. The vocalic phonemes of 4 are determined by the opposition of rounded and unrounded; and to the South moreover, the unrounded series splits into front and back: both for the higher and for the lower vowels the Ukrainian and the Bulgarian phonemic pattern distinguishes (a) unrounded front, (b) unrounded back, (c) rounded (back). The change of long vowels into decrescent diphthongs occurs only in the Western borderland of the Slavic world—in Czech, Polabian, and Kashubian.

In various regions of the Slavic world—in some Russian, Polish, Sorbian, and Serbocroatian dialects—the hushing and the corresponding hissing affricates, or generally sibilants, coalesced. A rare phoneme, the sibilant vibrant *r*, formerly common to the majority of the Western Slavic languages, is maintained in Czech and Kashubian.

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR

THE AUTONOMY of the word and the markedness of word boundaries are preserved both in Protoslavic and in the modern Slavic languages; and there is a clear-cut difference between the treatment of affixes on one hand, and proclitic conjunctions or enclitic particles on the other. The root plus derivational and inflectional suffixes forms a simple word. A root preceded by another root or by a prefix produces a complex word. Prepositions are phonemically treated as prefixes. Derivational suffixes remain an extremely productive means for neology in Slavic languages. Prefixes play only a derivational role but prefixation as such has an important part in the building of Slavic verbal aspects. Alternations of phonemes are relevant auxiliary means in Slavic inflection; pivotal are prosodic alternations both in Protoslavic and in those Slavic languages which maintain in their word structure such

193 distinctive features as pitch, quantity, or place of accent; as a result of the loss of the 'jers' alternations of vowel and zero as well as zero desinences occupy a great place in all Slavic languages. Autonomous alternations of different vowels in the root are in part the residue of Indo-European or Protoslavic processes, and in part essential innovations of separate Slavic languages, e.g., Ukrainian, Polish, Czech. In desinences vocalic alternations conditioned by the stem-end (a characteristic feature of late Protoslavic), remain, in spite of all analogic changes, a pertinent factor in the morphologic structure of modern Slavic languages. Due to various palatalization processes, the alternations of the last stem-consonant are partly inherited from Protoslavic, partly developed in the separate Slavic languages. There is still a pronounced tendency (particularly striking in Russian) to differentiate the alternations used in declension and those used in conjugation.

193 197 Protoslavic preserved the Indo-European system of cases (Nom., Acc., Instr., Dat., Gen., Loc.), losing only the ablative which merged with the genitive—the latter took over the ablative desinence for *o*-stems. The use of *m* in the Instr. and Dat. desinences links Slavic with the Baltic and Germanic area. The nominal declension exhibits a strong influence from the pronominal, an interaction of different paradigms, and a tendency to identify paradigms with genders. The impulse to unify the declension continues in separate Slavic languages. All of them tend to eliminate the prepositionless use of the Loc. and of the Dat. of destination. The substitution of the possessive Gen. for the original possessive adjective is widespread. Western and Eastern Slavic languages developed a predicative Instr. Bulgarian and Macedonian, for the most part, have lost declension (as well as the suffixal comparative forms of the adjectives) and developed instead a postpositive article. Distinction of single cases, weakened both formally and functionally in Sorbian, Czech, Slovenian, and Serbocroatian, is firmly held in the other Slavic languages and even enriched by two new cases (Gen. 2 and Loc. 2) in Russian, and the general meanings of the cases remain here distinctly delimited (e.g., the persistence of the Gen. of negation perfectly fits the general meaning of the genitive

as a purely restrictive case). The vocative form is preserved in all Slavic languages except Russian and Slovenian.

A sharp distinction between the singular and the plural unvaryingly goes through the whole Slavic inflection, whereas the dual, still vital in the Slavic medieval world, died out but for Slovenian, Sorbian, and Slovincian. Residues of the old nominal dual serve to denote nouns after numerals from 'two' to 'four' in Russian and Serbocroatian, and after all numerals in Bulgarian which, along with declension, lost the clear-cut Slavic difference between the substantivized numerals from 'five' and the lower numerals consistently adjectivized. Slavic substantives and adjectives still strikingly distinguish masculine, feminine, and neuter in the singular; in the plural, however, these distinctions are lost by Russian and Bulgarian and tend to weaken as well elsewhere. The difference between the animate and inanimate started for the Acc. Sg. M. in late Protoslavic and became generalized for some other cases in Western Slavic languages, and for the Acc. Pl. in Russian. Bulgarian, Western Slavic languages (particularly Polish and Sorbian), and Ukrainian tend to promote a new, personal gender.

For the adjectives Protoslavic developed a new, definite form which distinguishes more clearly their declension from that of the substantives. In Serbocroatian and Slovenian the difference between the definite and indefinite forms is more or less preserved and marked by prosodic alternations; Bulgarian and Macedonian have reduced the use of the definite form, whereas Byelo-Russian, Ukrainian, and Western Slavic languages tend to eliminate the indefinite doublet; Russian has changed it into a purely predicative, indeclinable form.

The Protoslavic verb had been more essentially reshaped than the noun. Only the forms of the present tense continue closely an Indo-European prototype; the forms of the aorist are perceptibly refashioned, while the forms of the Slavic imperfect have nothing in common with the Indo-European stock. Neither the form nor the function of the Indo-European perfect find correspondence in the Slavic. Besides two sets of simple forms—the sequential past (the so-called 'aorist') and the synchronic past (the so-called 'imperfect'), Slavic created new, compound pasts: the retrospective

193 past (inadequately called the 'perfect'), and three pluperfects
197 corresponding to the aorist, the imperfect, and the perfect. Protoslavic abolished the Indo-European subjunctive and innovated a compound conditional. The Indo-European optative was re-formed into an imperative, whereas the old imperative disappeared completely. The middle voice became obsolete and its functions were partly assumed by the Slavic (and Baltic) construction with the enclitic Acc. of the reflexive pronoun which had been generalized for all persons; besides, a periphrastic passive was developing with verbal adjectives changed into participles. The nominal forms of the verb, the infinitive and supine, are due to a convergent development in the Slavic and some other Indo-European dialects. Partly paralleled by the Baltic, Protoslavic developed a system of coupled verbs of perfective (denoting the completion of a process) and imperfective (without such denotation) aspect; of the imperfective verbs a few couples denote the opposition of determined (characterizing the process as an uninterrupted whole) and undetermined aspect. The future was usually expressed by either the present of perfective verbs or different periphrastic constructions with imperfective verbs. Various types of impersonal constructions were developed with a zero-subject and a verb in 3rd pers. Sg. or Pl. as predicate. Conjugation drew upon two stems, one full and another truncated, chiefly regular in their alternation (depending on the vocalic or consonantal onset of the desinence)—a feature which has persisted for the most part to the present time.

This rich set of verbal forms (in Old Church Slavonic an imperfective verb had up to 236 forms, without counting the compound ones) persisted fundamentally through the Middle Ages. Later, most of the Slavic languages generalized the original 'perfect' as the only past; the imperfect and the aorist have been kept only in Sorbian on the one hand, and in Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Serbocroatian on the other. These same Southern Slavic languages stabilized the use of the verb *xъtěti* 'want' for the compound future and generalized this construction for the perfective verbs as well, somewhat dampening (as Sorbian also does) the opposition of the aspects. Bulgarian and Macedonian have developed the richest

pattern of finite forms with a consistent opposition of direct and indirect narration. Fundamentally, the Protoslavic pattern of aspects, voices, and moods is preserved in all Slavic languages. The imperative becomes (especially in Russian and Ukrainian) a bare stem, agglutinating autonomous suffixes phonemically treated as particles. The supine remained only in Low Sorbian and Slovenian. The infinitive is lost in Bulgarian and Macedonian. Participles tended at an early date to do away with declension and to become gerunds—in the Eastern and partly also in the Western Slavic area they even lost gender and number.

Enclitics traditionally followed the first accented word, but in languages with free stress the inflected enclitics were attracted by the governing word and then completely eliminated in the whole Eastern Slavic area, except for Western Ukrainian dialects: in the reflexive verbs the pronoun became an inseparable suffix; the other pronominal enclitic forms, richly developed in Protoslavic, were lost; the auxiliary verb as used in the 3rd pers. Sg. Neutr. of the compound forms was generalized (in the conditional *by* and in the pluperfect *bylo* became mere particles); in the 'perfect' the pres. 3rd pers. zero-form of the auxiliary verb *byti* 'be,' when used for all persons, changed the 'perfect' into a simple form. Subsequently the present of *byti* was likewise omitted in its other functions and the use of the correlative verb *iměti* 'have' essentially reduced; the abolishment of the copula favored asyndeton; finally, in personal constructions the use of pronouns, which was pleonastic for the Slavic pattern, became normal and their omission, which was normal for the Slavic pattern, became elliptic.

Word order underwent some alterations in the separate development of the Slavic languages. Particularly the verb tends to a medial position in the sentence and the place of attributes depends on regional changes in the system of definite and indefinite adjectives. Generally, word order is still based on the same principles as in Protoslavic: there is one basic pattern and a set of usual deviations each of which possesses a distinct semantic or stylistic value. In the spoken Slavic languages hypotaxis is weakly developed and less used than parataxis. The evolution of Slavic languages shows an extreme instability of conjunctions and relative pronouns.